10/6 (15/- net)

K/5

Frederick C. Grant
March 1927

A GRAMMAR OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN GREEK

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
London: FETTER LANE, E.C.
C. F. CLAY, MANAGER

Edinburgh: 100, PRINCES STREET
Berlin: A. ASHER AND CO.
Leipzig: F. A. BROCKHAUS
New York: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
Bombay and Calcutta: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.

All rights reserved

A GRAMMAR OF
THE OLD TESTAMENT IN GREEK

ACCORDING TO THE SEPTUAGINT

BY

HENRY ST JOHN THACKERAY, M.A.

SOMETIME SCHOLAR OF KING'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

VOL. I

INTRODUCTION, ORTHOGRAPHY AND ACCIDENCE

Property of
CBDP
Please return to
Graduate Theological
Union Library

Cambridge :
at the University Press
1909

PA
713
T5
c.2

Cambridge:
PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A.
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

BR61.5
T363
v.1

TO MY WIFE

Γυναῖκα ἀνδρείαν τίς εὑρήσει;
τιμιωτέρα δέ ἐστιν λίθων πολυτελῶν ἡ τοιαύτη.

38565

PREFACE

THE Grammar, of which the first portion is here published, has during the last eight years been the occupation of the very limited leisure of a civil servant. It owes its origin to the suggestion of Dr Swete, who has throughout its preparation been the writer's kindly and encouraging ἐργοδιώκτης. It is due to his good offices that this portion now appears in the form of a separate volume, and it is needless to add that it is his edition of the text, together with the Concordance of the late Dr Redpath, which alone has rendered such a work possible.

It may be asked: What need is there for the work? Why write a Grammar of a translation, in parts a servile translation, into a Greek which is far removed from the Attic standard, of an original which was often imperfectly understood? A sufficient answer might be that the work forms part of a larger whole, the Grammar of Hellenistic Greek, the claims of which, as bridging the gulf between the ancient and the modern tongue upon the attention of φιλέλληνες and philologists have in recent years begun to receive their due recognition from a growing company of scholars. The Septuagint, in view both of the period which it covers and the

variety of its styles, ranging from the non-literary vernacular to the artificial Atticistic, affords the most promising ground for the investigation of the peculiarities of the Hellenistic or 'common' language. "La Septante est le grand monument de la Κοινή," says Psichari. But the Septuagint has, moreover, special claims of its own. Though of less paramount importance than the New Testament, the fact that it was the only form in which the older Scriptures were known to many generations of Jews and Christians and the deep influence which it exercised upon New Testament and Patristic writers justify a separate treatment of its language. Again, the fact that it is in the main a translation gives it a special character and raises the difficult question of the extent of Semitic influence upon the written and spoken Greek of a bilingual people.

The period covered by the books of the Septuagint was mentioned. This may conveniently be divided into three parts. (1) There is every reason to accept the very early tradition that the Greek Pentateuch, to which, it would seem, at least a partial translation of Joshua was soon appended, originated in the third century B.C. We are, then, in the Hexateuch taken back to the dawn of the Κοινή, to a period when certain forms and usages were in existence which had already become obsolete in New Testament times. Some of these are moribund survivals from classical Greek, others are experiments of the new language on their trial. (2) As to the remaining books, one result which clearly emerges is that the order in which they were translated was, roughly speaking, that of the Hebrew Canon. We may conjecture that the Prophets made their appearance in

a Greek dress in the second century B.C., Isaiah near the beginning of it, the group consisting of Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Twelve (or large portions of this group) nearer the close: the close of the century also probably saw the appearance of 1 Kingdoms and portions of 2 and 3 Kingdoms. (3) The versions of most of the "Writings" (Psalms perhaps excluded) and the composition of most of the apocryphal books seem, notwithstanding the oft-quoted statement in the Prologue of Ben Sira, to belong to a period not earlier than the first century B.C., while books like the Greek Ecclesiastes and Theodotion's Daniel carry us as far down as the second century of our era. To the third period (at least if we may judge from the character of the texts which have come down to us) we must also probably assign the translations of some of the later historical books, which the Hebrew Canon classed with the Prophets, viz. the bulk of Judges and large portions of 2—4 Kingdoms. Broadly speaking, we may say that the Greek of the first period attains the higher level exhibited by the papyri of the early Ptolemaic age (the *Petrie* and *Hibeh* collections), while in that of the second period we may see a reflection of the more degenerate[1] style of the papyri of the end of the second century B.C. (e.g. the *Tebtunis* collection). In the third period two opposite influences are at work: (i) the growing reverence for the letter of Scripture, tending to the production of pedantically literal versions, (ii) the influence of the Atticistic school, strongest, of course, in free writings like 4 Maccabees, but which

[1] See Mahaffy, *Empire of the Ptolemies*, 360.

seems also to have left some marks on versions such as 4 Kingdoms.

I can claim no special equipment for my task other than a persistent interest in the subject, and am conscious of many imperfections in its execution. In arrangement and treatment I have in general followed the guidance of the late Professor Blass in his *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, with which special associations have familiarized me. One subject there treated at length is missing in the present work. "Word-formation," an outlying province of grammar, is, for the LXX, so vast a subject that any approach to an adequate treatment of it would have immoderately swelled this book, which already exceeds the prescribed limits. Possibly an opportunity may arise in the future for making good the omission. It may be thought that too much space has been allotted to Orthography and Accidence. I may plead in excuse that it is in these departments that the papyri are specially helpful and afford some clear criteria as to dates, and it is hoped that the evidence here collected may be of service to the textual critic in the reconstruction of the original text of the LXX. Even the long series of references often have their message in showing the distribution of a usage, *φωνάεντα συνετοῖσιν.*

A complete and independent Grammar of the LXX has until quite recently been wanting, and the student had to be content with such casual assistance as was given in the New Testament Grammars. The useful treatise of Thiersch, now nearly seventy years old, was

limited to the Pentateuch. In recent years the "Septuagintarian" (if the word may be allowed) has had the advantage of a valuable chapter on the language in Dr Swete's *Introduction*, while two Oxford scholars have produced a very handy little volume of selections preceded by a concise but partial Grammar[1]. My ambition to produce the first complete Grammar has, through unavoidable delays, been frustrated, and Germany has led the way. I have thought it best to work quite independently of Dr Helbing's book[2], the first part of which appeared just over a year ago: indeed most of my book was written before the publication of the German work. I append a list, not exhaustive, of works which have been consulted. Psichari's admirable essay[3] only came into my hands when the pages had been set up. My slight incursions into modern Greek, with which I hope to become more closely acquainted, have convinced me of the truth of his statement that a knowledge of the living language is indispensable for a proper understanding of the κοινὴ διάλεκτος as represented by the LXX.

The pleasant duty remains of acknowledging assistance of a more personal and direct kind than that obtainable from books. Of my indebtedness to Dr Swete, the "onlie begetter" of this volume, I have already spoken. I owe more than I can say to the counsel and encouragement of Dr J. H. Moulton, Greenwood

[1] *Selections from the Septuagint*, F. C. Conybeare and St George Stock, Ginn and Co., Boston, 1905.

[2] *Grammatik der Septuaginta, Laut- und Wortlehre*, R. Helbing, Göttingen, 1907.

[3] *Essai sur le Grec de la Septante*, Paris, 1908.

Professor of Hellenistic Greek and Indo-European Philology in the Victoria University of Manchester. He has been good enough, amid his manifold duties, to read through the whole work in MS, and his generous and never-failing help has enriched its pages and removed many errors and imperfections. Through the *Prolegomena* to his brilliant Grammar of *New Testament Greek* and through private communications he has introduced me to much of the extensive literature bearing on the subject and held up a model of how a Grammar should be written. My thanks are also due to another Fellow of my own College, the Rev. A. E. Brooke, co-editor of the larger Cambridge Septuagint, who has kindly read the bulk of the proofs and offered useful suggestions. In the laborious work of verifying references much help has been rendered by Mr W. R. Taylor, sometime Scholar of St Catharine's College, Cambridge: he has also prepared the Index of quotations. Assistance of a kindred nature has been given by my sister, Mrs Loring, and by my wife. In conclusion, I must express my thanks to the Syndics of the University Press for their indulgence in consenting to the publication of this portion of the work as a separate volume and to all the officers, readers and workmen of the Press for their constant vigilance and well-known accuracy.

H. St J. T.

18 Royal Avenue, Chelsea,
31 *January* 1909.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.

SECT.		PAGE
1.	Grammar and Textual Criticism	1
2.	Grouping of LXX Books	6
3.	The *κοινή*—the Basis of LXX Greek	16
4.	The Semitic Element in LXX Greek	25
5.	The Papyri and the Uncial MSS of the LXX	55

ORTHOGRAPHY AND PHONETICS.

6.	The Vowels	71
7.	The Consonants	100
8.	The Aspirate	124
9.	Euphony in combination of Words and Syllables	129

ACCIDENCE.

10.	Declensions of the Noun	140
11.	Proper Names	160
12.	Adjectives	172
13.	The Numerals	186
14.	Pronouns	190
15.	The Verb. General Changes in Conjugation	193
16.	Augment and Reduplication	195

SECT. PAGE

17. Verbs in -Ω. Terminations 209
18. Verbs in -Ω. Tense formation 218
19. Verbs in -Ω. Present Tense 224
20. Verbs in -Ω. Future Tense 228
21. Verbs in -Ω. First and Second Aorist (and Future Passive) 233
22. Contract Verbs 241
23. Verbs in -MI 244
24. Table of Noteworthy Verbs 258

INDEX I. Of Subjects 291
II. Of Greek words and forms 300
III. Of Quotations 310

PRINCIPAL AUTHORITIES QUOTED WITH ABBREVIATIONS

Anz H., *Subsidia ad cognoscendum Graecorum sermonem vulgarem e Pentateuchi versione Alexandrina repetita* (Dissert. Phil. Halenses vol. 12), 1894.

Archiv = *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, ed. U. Wilcken, Leipzig, 1901 etc.

Aristeas (pseudo-), Letter of, in the Appendix to Swete's *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, or in the edition of P. Wendland, Leipzig, 1900: the §§ are those of Wendland which appear in Swete, edition 2.

Blass N.T. = Friedrich Blass, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, English translation, ed. 2, 1905.

Brooke A. E. and M°Lean N., *The Old Testament in Greek*, vol. I The Octateuch, part I Genesis, Cambridge, 1906.

BDB = Brown, Driver and Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, Oxford, 1906.

CR = *Classical Review*.

Crönert = W. Crönert, *Memoria Graeca Herculanensis*, *cum titulorum Aegypti papyrorum codicum denique testimoniis* etc., Leipzig, 1903.

Deissmann *BS* = G. A. Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, Engl. trans. Edinburgh, 1901.

Dieterich K., *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der griechischen Sprache* (*Byzantinisches Archiv*, Heft 1), Leipzig, 1898.

Dindorf W., *Poetae Scenici Graeci*, ed. 7, London, 1881.

Driver S. R., *A treatise on the use of the tenses in Hebrew*, ed. 3, Oxford, 1892: *Notes on the Hebrew text of the Books of Samuel*, Oxford, 1890: *The book of Daniel* in the *Cambridge Bible*, Cambridge, 1900.

Enc. Bibl. = *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, ed. Cheyne and Black, London, 1899 etc.

Field F., *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt*, Oxford, 1875.

Gregory *Prol.* = *Novum Testamentum Graece*, C. Tischendorf, vol. 3 *Prolegomena*, scripsit C. R. Gregory, Leipzig, 1894.

Hastings *BD* = *Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. J. Hastings, Edinburgh, 1898 etc.

Hatch E. and Redpath H. A., *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the other Greek Versions of the O.T.*, Oxford, 1897–1906.

Hatch E., *Essays in Biblical Greek*, Oxford, 1889.

Hatzidakis G. N., *Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik*, Leipzig, 1892.

Herodiani Technici Reliquiae, ed. A. Lentz, Leipzig, 1867.

Herwerden H. van, *Lexicon Graecum suppletorium et dialecticum*, Leyden, 1902.

Indog. Forsch. = *Indogermanische Forschungen.*

Jannaris A. N., *An historical Greek Grammar chiefly of the Attic dialect as written and spoken from classical antiquity down to the present time*, London, 1897.

J. T. S. = *Journal of Theological Studies*, (London and) Oxford.

Kälker F., *Quaestiones de elocutione Polybiana* etc., *Separat-abdruck aus "Leipziger Studien zur classischen Philologie,"* Leipzig, N.D.

Kautzsch E., *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments übersetzt und herausgegeben*, Tübingen, 1900.

Kennedy H. A. A., *Sources of New Testament Greek or the influence of the Septuagint on the vocabulary of the New Testament*, Edinburgh, 1895.

Kühner-Blass or K.-Bl. = *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* von R. Kühner, erster Teil, Elementar- und Formenlehre, dritte Auflage in zwei Bänden in neuer Bearbeitung, besorgt von F. Blass, Hannover, 1890–2.

Lagarde P. de, *Librorum Veteris Testamenti Canonicorum Pars prior Graece* (a reconstruction of the "Lucianic text" of the historical books of the LXX), Göttingen, 1883.

LS = Liddell and Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, ed. 7, Oxford, 1883.

Mayser E., *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* etc., *Laut- und Wortlehre*, Leipzig, 1906.

McNeile A. H., *An Introduction to Ecclesiastes with Notes and Appendices*, Cambridge, 1904.

Meisterhans = *Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften* von K. Meisterhans, dritte vermehrte und verbesserte Auflage, besorgt von E. Schwyzer, Berlin, 1900.

Moulton *Prol.* = J. H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol. I *Prolegomena*, 3rd edition, Edinburgh, 1908.

Moulton-Geden = W. F. Moulton and A. S. Geden, *A Concordance to the Greek Testament*, Edinburgh, 1899.

Mozley F. W., *The Psalter of the Church, the Septuagint Psalms compared with the Hebrew, with various notes*, Cambridge, 1905.

Nachmanson E., *Laute und Formen der Magnetischen Inschriften*, Uppsala, 1903.

Oracula Sibyllina, ed. A. Rzach, Vienna, 1891.

Ottley R. R., *The Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint* (*Codex Alexandrinus*) translated and edited, 2 vols., Cambridge, 1904–6.

Reinhold H., *De graecitate Patrum Apostolicorum librorumque apocryphorum Novi Testamenti Quaestiones grammaticae* (Dissert. Philol. Halenses, vol. XIV, pars I), Halle, 1898.

Rutherford (W. G.) *NP* = *The New Phrynichus, being a revised text of the Ecloga of the grammarian Phrynichus*, London, 1881.

Schleusner J. F., *Novus Thesaurus philologico-criticus sive Lexicon in LXX et reliquos interpretes Graecos ac scriptores apocryphos Veteris Testamenti*, Leipzig, 1820.

Schmidt W., *De Flavii Josephi elocutione observationes criticae*, Leipzig, 1893.

Schmiedel: see W.-S.

Schweizer *Perg.* = Schweizer (now Schwyzer) E., *Grammatik der Pergamenischen Inschriften, Beiträge zur Laut- und Flexionslehre der gemeingriechischen Sprache*, Berlin, 1898.

Steindorff G., *Koptische Grammatik*, Berlin, 1894.

Sturz F. W., *De dialecto Macedonica et Alexandrina liber*, Leipzig, 1808.

Swete H. B., *The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*, ed. 2, Cambridge, 1895–99: *Introd.* = *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, ed. 2, Cambridge, 1902.

Test. XII. Patr. = *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* etc., ed. R. H. Charles, Oxford, 1908.

Thiersch H. W. J., *De Pentateuchi versione Alexandrina libri tres*, Erlangen, 1840.

Thumb A., *Asp.* = *Untersuchungen über den Spiritus Asper im griechischen*, Strassburg, 1888: *Handbuch* = *Handbuch der neugriechischen Volkssprache, Grammatik, Texte, Glossar*, ib., 1895: *Hell.* = *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus, Beiträge zur Geschichte und Beurteilung der* Κοινή, ib., 1901.

Veitch W., *Greek Verbs irregular and defective*, Oxford, 1866.

Wackernagel J., *Hellenistica*, Göttingen, 1907.

WH = Westcott B. F. and Hort F. J. A., *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, Cambridge, Text 1890, Introduction and Appendix (ed. 2), 1896.

W.-S. = *Winer's Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms, Achte Auflage, neubearbeitet* von P. W. Schmiedel, 1 Theil, *Einleitung und Formenlehre*, Göttingen, 1894.

Witkowski S., *Epistulae privatae Graecae quae in papyris aetatis Lagidarum servantur*, Leipzig, 1906–7.

ZNTW = *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, ed. E. Preuschen, Giessen.

The references to the above and other works are to pages, unless otherwise stated.

COLLECTIONS OF PAPYRI REFERRED TO IN THIS VOLUME

AP = *Amherst Papyri*, ed. Grenfell and Hunt, 1900–1.

BM i, ii etc. = *Greek Papyri in the British Museum*, ed. Kenyon, 1893– .

BU = *Aegyptische Urkunden aus den Koenigl. Museen zu Berlin, Griechische Urkunden*, ed. Wilcken etc., 1895– .

CPR = *Corpus Papyrorum Raineri*, ed. C. Wessely, Vienna, 1895.

FP = *Fayum Towns and their Papyri*, ed. Grenfell and Hunt, 1900.

G = Grenfell, *An Alexandrian erotic fragment and other Greek Papyri, chiefly Ptolemaic*, 1896.
GH = Grenfell and Hunt, *Greek Papyri*, Series II, 1897.
GP = *Les Papyrus de Genève*, ed. J. Nicole, 1896–1900.
HP = *Hibeh Papyri*, Part I, ed. Grenfell and Hunt, 1906.
Leiden Pap. = *Papyri Graeci Musei...Lugduni Batavi*, ed. Leemans, 1843–85.
OP i, ii etc. = *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, ed. Grenfell and Hunt, 1898– .
Par. = (Paris Papyri) *Notices et Extraits des MSS*, tom. xviii, ed. Brunet de Presle, Paris, 1858.
PP i, ii = *Flinders Petrie Papyri*, in *Proc. Royal Irish Academy, Cunningham Memoirs*, ed. J. P. Mahaffy, 1891–93.
Teb. = *Tebtunis Papyri*, ed. Grenfell, Hunt and Smyly, 1902.
TP = (Turin Papyri) *Papyri Graeci Regii Taurinensis Musei Aegyptii*, ed. Peyron, 1826.

ii/B.C. = 2nd century B.C., ii/A.D. = 2nd century A.D., ii/–iii/A.D. = a date falling about the end of ii/A.D. or the beginning of iii/A.D.

The abbreviations for the books of the O.T. for the most part explain themselves. Jd. = Judges, Jdth = Judith. For the signs used to denote the different strata in the last three Books of Reigns or Kingdoms (K. $\beta\beta$, K. $\beta\gamma$, K. $\gamma\gamma$, K. $\gamma\delta$, K. $\beta\delta$) see p. 10: for Jer. α, β and γ, Ez. α, β and $\beta\beta$, see p. 11: for Parts I and II of Exodus, Leviticus and Psalms pp. 66 and 68. Job Θ indicates the passages in Job which are absent from the Sahidic version and are shown by their style to be later interpolations from Theodotion into the original partial Greek translation (see p. 4): other passages besides those so indicated may have been interpolated from the same source. Ψ tit. denotes the titles of the Psalms: some details in their vocabulary afford reason for thinking that they did not form part of the original Greek version. α' = Aquila, Θ = Theodotion. The text used is that of Dr Swete and, as this has by now well-nigh supplanted all others, it seemed needless to cumber the pages with the alternative numbers for the verses which he quotes in brackets.

CORRIGENDA AND ADDENDA

p. 10, 12 lines from end. *Read* "K. *a* has 151 examples" of the hist. pres.: my figures have been checked by Sir John Hawkins.
11, end of 2nd paragraph. *For* § 7, 44 *read* § 7, 46.
24, line 18. *For* Dan. Θ *read* Dan. O.
25, line 18. *For* "Tobit" *read* "the B text of Tobit."
38, line 16. *For* פֵּה *read* פֶּה.
50, last line. *For* ὀρῷν *read* ὀρᾶν.
69, line 6. *For* εὐπρεπ(ε)ία etc. *read* εὐπρέπ(ε)ια, μεγαλοπρέπ.
79, line 12. *For* 4, 52 א *read* 4 א, 52 א.
80, note 6. *For* PP^2 *read* PP ii.
91, § 6, 32. *For* πρᾳύς *read* πραύς.
125, 3 (3) line 1. *For* ἴδου *read* ἰδού.
170, note 3, line 1. *For* Jos. xv. 60 *read* Jos. xv. 61.
172, note 1. *For* -ια *read* -ία.
238, line 10. *For* κατ- *read* κατα-.

---

p. 13. The severance of 2 Esdras from Chronicles LXX needs a word of justification. I believe Sir Henry Howorth to be right in his contention that 2 Esdras is the work of Theodotion: as regards Chron. LXX, certain Egyptian traits (p. 167 n., cf. *J. T. S.* VIII. 276 f.) and a rather greater freedom of style have made me hesitate in following Sir Henry to the natural conclusion that Θ is responsible for this translation also. A strong case has recently been made in support of this view, based mainly on the numerous transliterations in both portions, in a work to which Sir Henry drew my attention (*Old Testament and Semitic Studies in memory of W. R. Harper: Apparatus for the Textual Criticism of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah:* by C. C. Torrey, Chicago, 1908). If these critics are right, it is necessary to suppose that Θ for Chron. made use of an earlier version such as was not before him for Ezra-Nehemiah.

p. 33, lines 1, 2. To the renderings of שִׁבֹּר should be added ζῦθος, the beer of Alexandria (Strabo 799), which the Isaiah translator appropriately introduces in "the vision of Egypt" (xix. 10).

p. 70. Ezekiel Part I, Part II: this indicates the main division of the Greek book into two parts: for further subdivision of Part II see p. 11—The suggestion that the passage in 3 K. viii. 53 which is absent from M.T. may be a later gloss must be withdrawn: see on this very interesting section Swete *Introd.* 247 f.

p. 138, lines 3, 4. For further exx. of κἄν see p. 99, n. 2.

p. 146, § 10, 12. For 3rd decl. acc. in -αν see Psichari, *Essai sur le Grec de la Septante*, 164 ff.

p. 156, n. 3. But πάτραρχον Is. xxxvii. 28 and πάτρια viii. 21 are, as Prof. Burkitt reminds me, probably corruptions of an original παταχρά = Aram. פתכרא "a (false) god" or "idol," which must be added to the other Aramaisms in this book (γειώρας, σίκερα). See Field Hex. on viii. 21.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. Grammar and Textual Criticism.

Is it possible to write a grammar of the Septuagint? That is the question which must constantly arise in the mind of one who undertakes the task. The doubt arises not because the Greek, strange as it often is, is utterly defiant of the laws of grammar: the language in which the commonly received text is composed has some laws of its own which can be duly tabulated. The question rather is, "Where is the true 'Septuagint' text to be found?" We possess in the Cambridge Manual Edition the text of the Codex Vaticanus with a collation of the other principal uncials: in Holmes and Parsons we have a collation of the cursives and versions: and now in the Larger Cambridge Septuagint we have the first instalment of a thoroughly trustworthy collection of all the available evidence. But we are still far from the period when we shall have a text, analogous to the New Testament of Westcott and Hort, of which we can confidently state that it represents, approximately at least, the original work of the translators. Is it, then, premature to attempt to write a Grammar, where the text is so doubtful? Must the grammarian wait till the textual critic has completed his task?

It is true that no final grammar of the LXX can be written at present. But the grammarian cannot wait for the final verdict of textual criticism. Grammar and criticism must

proceed concurrently, and in some ways the former may contribute towards a solution of the problems which the latter has to face.

The grammarian of the Greek Old Testament has, then, this distinct disadvantage as compared with the N.T. grammarian, that he has no Westcott-Hort text for his basis, and is compelled to enter into questions of textual criticism. Moreover the task of recovering the oldest text in the O.T. is, for two reasons at least, more complicated than in the N.T. In the first place, the oldest MS, containing practically a complete text, is the same for both Testaments, namely the Codex Vaticanus, but whereas in the one case the date of the MS is separated from the dates of the autographs by an interval (considerable indeed) of some three centuries, in the case of the O.T. the interval, at least for the earliest books, is nearly doubled. A yet more serious difficulty consists in the relative value of the text of this MS in the Old and in the New Testaments. The textual history of either portion of the Greek Bible has one crisis and turning-point, from which investigation must proceed. It is the point at which "mixture" of texts begins. In the N.T. this point is the "Syrian revision," which, although no actual record of it exists, must have taken place in or about the fourth century A.D. The corresponding crisis in the history of the LXX text is Origen's great work, the Hexapla, dating from the middle of the third century. This laborious work had, as Septuagint students are painfully aware, an effect which its compiler never contemplated, and he must be held responsible for the subsequent degeneration of the text. His practice of inserting in the Septuagint column fragments of the other versions, Theodotion's in particular, duly indicated by him as insertions by the asterisks which he prefixed, caused the multiplication of copies containing the insertions but wanting the necessary precautionary signs. This, together with the practice of scribes of writing in the margins (from which

they were in later copies transferred to the text) the alternative renderings or transliterations contained in the other columns of the Hexapla, is the *fons et origo mali* as regards the Septuagint text. Now, whereas the Codex Vaticanus was written before the Syrian revision of the N. T., or at any rate contains a pre-Syrian text, it is posterior to the Hexapla, and contains a text of the O.T. which, though superior on the whole to that of Codex Alexandrinus, is yet not entirely free from Hexaplaric interpolations.

A few instances may be quoted showing the sort of mixture with which we have to deal.

(1) Take the A text of 3 Kingdoms at any of the passages where B has no rendering of the Massoretic text e.g. 3 K. ix. 15 ff. *αὕτη ἡ πραγματία τῆς προνομῆς ἣς ἀνήνεγκεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Σαλωμὼν οἰκοδομῆσαι τὸν οἶκον κυ, καὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ σὺν τὴν Μελὼ κ.τ.λ.* We are at once struck by the occurrence of *σύν* preceding the accusative, which occurs in *vv.* 16, 24, 25, and is recognised as Aquila's rendering of את: other striking words are found to be either expressly stated to be Aquila's renderings in this passage or to be characteristic of his version and absent, or practically absent, from the record in the Concordance of LXX usage (e.g. *καθόδους* and *ἀπήρτισεν* in verse 25). Similar interpolations, presumably from Aquila, occur in the A text at 3 K. viii. 1, xi. 38 (N.B. *κακουχήσω*: the verb is frequent in Aquila, but occurs once only again in LXX viz. 3 K. ii. 26 where probably the text of both B and A has been interpolated), xiii. 26 (N.B. *τῷ λέγειν*=לאמר), 29 (with *νεκρομαῖον* cf. *α'* Dt. xiv. 8 *νεκριμαῖον*), xiv. 1—20, xxii. 47—50: there are smaller insertions, apparently from the same source, in the A text of 4 K. e.g. xii. 4, xvi. 9 (*Κυρήνηνδε*), xvii. 14, xxv. 9.

From these passages we infer that in these two books (i) the shorter text of B is the older, (ii) that the passages which B omits were either absent from the Hebrew which the translators had before them or that the omission was intentional, the translation not aiming at completeness, (iii) that A has supplied the missing portions from Aquila, as Origen had probably previously done in the Hexapla, (iv) that B has remained comparatively, though probably not wholly, free from Hexaplaric interpolation.

(2) Or take the book of Job. A careful reading of the Greek and Hebrew will reveal the existence of two completely different styles, a free paraphrastic rendering in idiomatic

Greek, with every now and again passages of quite another character, containing Hebraisms, transliterations, etymological renderings of Divine names (Ἱκανός=שדי, ὁ Ἰσχυρός=אל), in fact a rendering that aims at completeness and accuracy without much regard to style. Now we are told that the original version was much shorter than the received Hebrew text, and that Origen supplied the missing portions from Theodotion: and, by good fortune, the Sahidic version has preserved a pre-Origenic text, from which the Theodotion passages are absent[1]. We are thus enabled to mark off in Dr Swete's text, the Theodotion portions. But we cannot even then be quite certain that we have got back to the original text. Passages from Theodotion may have already, independently of the Hexapla, found their way into the Greek text on which the Sahidic version was based, or that text may have been affected by "mixture" of another kind. Still, a study of the vocabulary of the bracketed Theodotion passages will provide a criterion by means of which the critic will be better prepared to detect the influence of his style elsewhere. It will be noticed that in this book the text of B, and of all the uncials, is Hexaplaric.

(3) Or take the list in Jos. xxi. of the cities with their "suburbs" (מגרשים) which were given to the Levites, and note how in *vv.* 2—11 and again in *vv.* 34—42 the word for "suburbs" is rendered, 17 times in all[2] by (τὰ) *περισπόρια* (*αὐτῆς*), whereas in the intervening verses 13—32 it is rendered 35 times by (τὰ) *ἀφωρισμένα* (*αὐτῇ*)[3]. Now Aquila read *περισπόρια* in *v.* 15 (vide Field's Hexapla). It appears probable, then, that the original text had a shorter list of cities and suburbs =*τὰ ἀφωρισμένα* (cf. Lev. xxv. 34, Jos. xiv. 4), and that Aquila's version has again, as in the A text of 3 K., been drawn upon to complete the list[4]. Here again interpolation has affected the text of both B and A.

The elimination of Hexaplaric additions being, thus, the first task of the textual criticism of the LXX, a study of the style and vocabulary of the three later versions, more especially

[1] A list of the passages omitted in the Sahidic VS is given in Lagarde *Mittheilungen* 1884, p. 204. Cf. esp. Hatch *Essays in Bibl. Greek* 215 ff.

[2] Also by A in *v.* 19.

[3] Excluding *τὴν* (*τὰς*) *ἀφωρισμ.* in 27, 32, which render another word.

[4] In N. xxxv. 2—7 this word "suburbs" is rendered by four separate words, viz. *προάστια*, *ἀφορίσματα*, *συνκυροῦντα*, *ὅμορα*. Variety of rendering characterizes the Pentateuch, and it is not *necessary* to infer Hexaplaric influence here.

of Theodotion, is a necessary preliminary. The study of Theodotion's style is the more important for two reasons. (1) It was always a popular version, mainly, no doubt, because it steered a middle course between the idiomatic Greek, tending to paraphrase, of Symmachus, and the pedantic un-Greek literalism of Aquila: it combined accuracy with a certain amount of style. Theodotion's version of Daniel supplanted the older paraphrase in the Christian Bible, and it was to Theodotion that Origen usually had recourse to fill the gaps in the older version in the Septuagint column of the Hexapla. (2) Aquila's version betrays itself by certain well-known characteristics, whereas Theodotion fragments are not so easily detected. On the other hand we have in his version of Daniel (where it deviates from the Chisian text), and in the Θ portions of Job, a considerable body of material from which something may be learnt as to his characteristics. A complete vocabulary of the portions which can certainly be attributed to Theodotion is a desideratum.

In concluding these few observations on the text, it must be added that the present writer has practically confined himself to the text of the uncials collated for the Cambridge Manual edition. The first instalment of the larger Cambridge LXX has been consulted for all passages in Genesis where important grammatical points arise, though most of this portion of the Grammar was prepared before its appearance. Occasional use has also been made of Lagarde's edition of the Lucianic text, Field's Hexapla, and the great corpus of cursive evidence collected in the edition of Holmes and Parsons. A full use of the last-named work would not only have delayed the appearance of this work for perhaps many years, but would also have caused it to exceed the limits laid down for it, without (it is believed) a proportionate addition to any value which it may possess.

§ 2. Grouping of LXX Books.

We have in the Septuagint a miscellaneous collection of Greek writings—some translations, others paraphrases, others of which the Greek is the original language—covering a period of upwards of three centuries, from the Pentateuch, the translation of which, there is no reason to doubt, goes back into the first half of the third century B.C., to the academical essay known as 4 Maccabees and the latter portion of Baruch, which must both be placed towards the close of the first century of our era. It is clearly desirable and should not be impossible, considering the length of this period, to find some means of classifying this motley collection. The first and obvious division is into translations and original Greek compositions. But the translations, though on a casual perusal they might appear to stand all on one level of mediocrity, on closer investigation are found to fall into certain distinct categories.

The object in view, and the method by which we seek to attain it, are not unlike the object and the method of the textual critic. The object, in this case, is not the grouping of MSS according to the character of the text which they contain, but the grouping of books or portions of books according to their style. The study of individual books from the linguistic point of view is followed by the study of groups. It would, of course, be unreasonable to expect undeviating uniformity of translation of the same Hebrew word in any one translator: if, however, it is found that a phrase is consistently rendered in one way in one portion of the Greek Bible, and in another way elsewhere, and if, as we proceed to extend our investigations to the renderings of other Hebrew phrases, the same divergence between two portions of the LXX is apparent, we gain an increasing assurance that we have to deal with two distinct groups of books, which are the production of different translators and possibly of different epochs. Each group may

be the work of several translators, but, if so, they have all come under the same influences and belong, as it were, to a single school. The method upon which we proceed is not so much to trace the history of the meaning of a single Greek word through the LXX (though that method also may sometimes be fruitful in results) as to trace the rendering of a single Hebrew phrase in the different books. The Hebrew index in the final fasciculus of the Concordance of Hatch and Redpath facilitates this task. The difficulty is to discover Hebrew phrases which occur with sufficient frequency throughout the whole Bible to serve as "tests" and yet are not such every-day expressions that Greek translators of any class or period could not fail to render them in one and the same way. Vocabulary affords the easiest criterion to begin with: the results which it yields can then be tested by grammatical phenomena.

We proceed to take a few examples.

(1) In the phrase "the servant of the Lord" (עבד יהוה) as applied to Moses the word "servant" is rendered in the following ways:

(i) *θεράπων* in the Pentateuch (Ex. iv. 10, xiv. 31, N. xi. 11, xii. 7, 8, Dt. iii. 24), also in Jos. i. 2, ix. 4, 6: cf. W. x. 16 (under the influence of Exodus) and 1 Ch. xvi. 40 (the words *ἐν χειρὶ* M. *τοῦ θεράποντος τοῦ θεοῦ* are unrepresented in M.T. and are probably a gloss). Cf. also *ὁ θεράπων μου* Ἰώβ, Job *passim* (twice with v. l. *παῖς*).

(ii) *οἰκέτης* Dt. xxxiv. 5.

(iii) *παῖς*[1] constantly in Joshua (12 times) i. 7, etc., (in xiv. 7 A has *δοῦλος*), also in 1 Ch. vi. 49, 2 Ch. i. 3, xxiv. 9, 2 Es. xi. 7, 8, Bar. ii. 28 (cf. i. 20), Dan. O ix. 11.

(iv) *δοῦλος* 3 K. viii. 53, 56, 4 K. xviii. 12, xxi. 8, 2 Es. xix. 14, xx. 29, ψ civ. 26, Mal. iv. 6, Dan. Θ ix. 11.

Extending the investigation to the rendering of the phrase when used of other servants of God (David, the prophets, etc.), we find that the versions fluctuate between (iii) and (iv). (iii) occurs throughout Isaiah (along with *δοῦλος* in the later chapters,

[1] Used in the Pentateuch of Caleb, N. xiv. 24.

xlii. 19 etc.), in the latter part of Jeremiah (xxvi. 28, xxxiii. 5, xlii. 15, li. 4) and in Baruch (5 times). On the other hand the first half of Jeremiah (vii. 25, xxv. 4, xxvi. 27, cf. iii. 22)[1], Ezekiel (6 times) and the Minor Prophets (8 times) consistently use (iv).

Turning to the N. T. we find that the word θεράπων is confined to the O. T. quotation in Hebr. iii. 5 (=N. xii. 7), παῖς in metaphorical sense of a worshipper of God is limited to the O. T. quotation in Mt. xii. 18 (=Is. xlii. 1) and to the opening chapters in Luke's two writings, where it is used of Israel and David (Lc. i. 54, 69, Acts iv. 25) and of Christ (Acts iii. 13, 26, iv. 27, 30). On the other hand, the constant phrase in the mouth of Paul and other N. T. writers when speaking of themselves or of others is δοῦλος (Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ): note how the writer of the Apocalypse uses δοῦλος of Moses in xv. 3, though he has in mind Ex. xiv. 31 (θεράποντι).

We cannot fail to note in the LXX renderings a growing tendency to emphasize the distance between God and man. Θεράπων "the confidential attendant" is replaced by οἰκέτης[2] (which may include all members of the household and therefore implies close intimacy), then by the more colourless but still familiar παῖς, finally by δοῦλος the "bond-servant" without a will of his own.

(2) The same tendency as in the last instance is observable in the renderings of the *verb* עבד, viz. λατρεύειν and δουλεύειν[3]. The Pentateuch makes the distinction that λατρεύειν applies to the service of God (and the gods, Ex. xx. 5, xxiii. 24, L. xviii. 21, Dt. *passim*) whereas service rendered to man is expressed by δουλεύειν (by λατρεύειν only in Dt. xxviii. 48, see note 2 below). Joshua uses λατρεύειν similarly. Jd. (A and B texts) is inconsistent as regards the word used to express service of God and the gods, the A text having λατρεύειν 9 times, δουλεύειν twice, the B text having λατρεύειν 5 times (up to iii. 7) δουλεύειν 6 times. On the other hand 1 K. and the majority of the remaining books use δουλεύειν indiscriminately of service rendered to God or man, the only other examples of λατρεύειν occurring in 2 K. xv. 8, 4 K. (6 times), 2 Ch. (vii. 19). The grouping here is not quite the regular one, Jd. B, 2 K. (last part) and 4 K. usually siding with the latest group of LXX books.

(3) "The Lord (*or* God) of hosts": יהוה (אלהי) צבאות The renderings of this phrase show a fairly well-marked dis-

[1] Also as a v. l. in A in xlii. 15, li. 4.

[2] The last few chapters of Dt. seem to occupy a position by themselves in the Pentateuch.

[3] Θεραπεύειν only in Is. liv. 17.

tinction between the LXX books. The phrase, unfortunately, is absent from the Pentateuch as well as from Ezekiel, Job, etc.

(i) There is transliteration, (Κύριος) *σαβαώθ*, in 1 K. (i. 3, 11, 20, xv. 2, xvii. 45) and in Isaiah *passim* (about 57 times)[1].

(ii) There is paraphrase, (Κύριος) Παντοκράτωρ, in the first part of 2 K. (v. 10, vii. 8, 25 B, 26 A, 27), in 3 K. xix. 10, 14, 1 Ch. xi. 9, xvii. 7, 24 (xxix. 12, M. T. has no equivalent) and throughout Jeremiah and the Minor Prophets, Zechariah alone having some 60 examples of it.

(iii) There is translation, (Κύριος) *τῶν δυνάμεων*, throughout the Psalms, in 4 K. (iii. 14, xix. 20 [not in M. T.] 31) and sporadically elsewhere: (1 K. iv. 4 A), 2 K. vi. 18, 3 K. xvii. 1 (not in M.T.), xviii. 15, (Am. vi. 14 B), Zeph. ii. 9, Zech. (i. 3 B *bis*), vii. 4 (Jer. xl. 12, om. A*). (iii) is also Theodotion's rendering (Jer. xxxvi. 17) and from his version the *variae lectiones* in the passages last quoted have doubtless come. Aquila's rendering is Κύριος *τῶν στρατιῶν*: Symmachus has *στρατιῶν*, *δυνάμεων* and other words.

The limits of this work preclude further details of this kind. Pursuing these researches into vocabulary and grammar, we find that, considered from the point of view of style, the translated books (excluding the more paraphrastic renderings) fall into three main groups. At the head stands the Pentateuch, distinguished from the rest by a fairly high level of style (for *κοινή* Greek), combined with faithfulness to the original, rarely degenerating into literalism. At the other extreme stands a group, consisting mainly of some of the later historical books (Jd. + Ruth [B text], 2 K. xi. 2—3 K. ii. 11, 3 K. xxii. 1—4 K. end, 2 Es.: the Psalter has some affinity with it), in which we see the beginnings of the tendency towards pedantic literalism, which ended in the second century A.D. in the barbarous "version" of Aquila. Between these two extremes lie the remainder of the books, all falling behind the standard set up

[1] Also in Jos. vi. 17 B (*τῶν δυνάμεων* AF: M. T. merely יהוה), Jer. xxvi. 10 AQ (om. *σαβαώθ* B א), Zech. xiii. 2 BAΓ (om. *σαβ.* AQ): cf. 1 Es. ix. 46 A where it is prefixed to Παντοκράτορι.

by the Pentateuch, but approximating with varying degrees of success to that model.

We find also that diversities of style present themselves within a single book. These are not such diversities as can readily be accounted for by Hexaplaric influence: they are not cases (as in the Greek Job) where the gaps in an original partial version have been filled by extracts from Theodotion or from other sources. The break occurs at a definite point in the centre of a book, on either side of which the language has its own distinct characteristics. The evidence for this statement has been given by the present writer in the case of certain books, viz., (*a*) the books of Kingdoms, (*b*) Jeremiah and Ezekiel in the pages of the *Journal of Theological Studies*[1]. Further research may lead to the discovery of similar phenomena in other books.

The books of Kingdoms may be divided as follows:

Earlier portions	K. *α* (=1 K.), K. *ββ* (=2 K. i. 1—xi. 1), K. *γγ* (=3 K. ii. 12—xxi. 43).
Later portions	K. *βγ* (=2 K. xi. 2—3 K. ii. 11), K. *γδ* (=3 K. xxii. 1—4 K. end).

The portions K. *βγ* and K. *γδ* (referred to collectively as K. *βδ*) are, it appears, the work of a single hand. They are distinguished from the remaining portions by their particles and prepositions (e.g. *καί γε*=כִּי, *καὶ μάλα*, *ἡνίκα*, *ἀνθ' ὧν ὅτι*, *ἀπάνωθεν*), by the almost complete absence of the historic present (K. *α* has 145 examples, *ββ* 28, *γγ* 47), by the use of *ἐγώ εἰμι* followed by a finite verb and by their vocabulary: they have much in common with Theodotion. The other portions are free from these peculiarities, though they do not rise much above K. *βδ* in point of style: the original version of K. *γγ*, so far as it is possible to conjecture what it was like in the uncertain state of the text, seems to have been more paraphrastic and therefore more idiomatic than the rest. In the case of these books we are not without external support for the divisions to which we are led by considerations of style, nor is it difficult to conjecture why the books were divided as they appear to have been. The Lucianic text actually brings the second book

[1] Vol. IV. 245, 398, 578: vol. VIII. 262.

down to 3 K. ii. 11 (making the break at the death of David and the accession of Solomon, a much more natural point than that selected in the M. T.); 2 K. xi. 2 marks the beginning of David's downfall, and the Chronicler, like the translator of K. *ββ*, also cuts short his narrative at this point. It appears that the more disastrous portions in the narrative of the Monarchy were left on one side when the earlier translators of the נביאים ראשונים did their work.

The books of Jeremiah and Ezekiel are divided as follows:

Jer. *α* = i. 1—xxviii. 64 (li. 64 M. T.),
Jer. *β* = xxix. 1—li. 35 (xlv. 5 M. T.),
Jer. *γ* = lii.
Ez. *α* = i. 1—xxvii. 36 and xl. 1—xlviii. end,
Ez. *β* = xxviii. 1—xxxix. 29 excluding
Ez. *ββ* = xxxvi. 24—38.

The two styles in Jeremiah *α* and *β* are quite unmistakable, though, owing to a certain mixture of the two on either side of the juncture (in which the hand of a reviser may perhaps be traced), the exact point where the second hand begins cannot be certainly fixed to a verse: perhaps it should be placed a little lower down in chap. xxix. A clear test is afforded in this book by the phrase "Thus saith the Lord," which is consistently rendered in *α* by Τάδε λέγει Κύριος (about 60 times, down to xxix. 8), in *β* by Οὕτως εἶπεν Κύριος (about 70 times from xxx. 1), with a solitary example of a mixture of the two renderings at or near the juncture, τάδε εἶπεν Κύριος xxix. 13 B. Jer. *γ* is probably a later appendix to the Greek book: the occurrence of the form φυλάττειν (lii. 24 B, 31 A) suggests at least that this chapter has an independent history (see § 7, 44).

Equally unmistakable are the two styles in Ezekiel *α* and *β*. The two noticeable features here are (1) the cessation of the first style midway through the Book and its resumption after an interval of a dozen chapters, (2) the intervention in the second style which characterizes these twelve chapters of a passage, fifteen verses long (*ββ*), marked by yet a third style, closely resembling that of Theodotion. The passage in question (containing the promise of a new heart) has for many centuries been one of the lessons for Pentecost, and its use for that purpose appears to have been taken over from Judaism.

The problems awaiting solution in Jer. and Ez. are two, (1) Are the two main portions in either book the work of contemporaries and do they indicate a division by agreement of the labour of translating a book of considerable length, or was the first translation a partial one, subsequently completed? The former suggestion has in its favour the fact that the books

appear to have been divided in the first place into two nearly equal portions (cf. § 5). (2) Is Ez. ββ earlier or later than the version of Ez. β which encloses it? In other words did the translator of Ez. β incorporate in his work a version which had already been made for lectionary use in the synagogues of Alexandria? Or, on the other hand, has a subsequent rendering, made for a Christian lectionary, ousted from all our MSS the original version, now lost, of these fifteen verses? The first suggestion would throw light on the *origines* of the Greek Bible: the second is, on the whole, more probable.

It should be added that the style of Ez. α and that of the Minor Prophets have much in common and the translators probably belong to the same period: Jer. α also has some kinship with this group.

The last sentence raises the question, Can we detect the reappearance of any translator in separate books of the LXX? Besides the possibility of the first hand in Ezekiel reappearing in the Minor Prophets, the strong probability, amounting almost to certainty, of identity of hands in the case of the latter part of 2 Kingdoms and 4 Kingdoms has already been mentioned. Again, the first half of Baruch is, beyond a doubt, the production of the translator of Jeremiah β[1]. Lastly the hand that has produced the partial and paraphrastic rendering of the story of the Return from the Exile (Esdras α) may, with confidence, be traced in the earlier chapters of the Chisian text of Daniel, a book which this paraphrast handled with just the same freedom as he had employed upon Chronicles—Ezra—Nehemiah[2]. In both cases it was subsequently found necessary to incorporate in the Greek Bible a more accurate version.

The following table is an attempt to classify the LXX books—translations, paraphrases and original Greek compositions—into groups from the point of view of style. The classification is, of course, a rough one. Isaiah, considered as a translation, would certainly not be placed in the first class. Class II is a large one, containing books of various styles.

[1] *J. T. S.* IV. 261 ff.
[2] See article "Esdras I" in Hastings *B. D.* I. 761 b.

Class III includes one production of Aquila and at least one book (2 Esdras) which may be the work of Theodotion. The question whether Tobit had a Hebrew original is an open one.

	Translations.	
1.	Good κοινή Greek	Pentateuch. Joshua (part). Isaiah. 1 Maccabees.
2.	Indifferent Greek	Jeremiah α (i.—xxviii.). Ezekiel (α and β) with Minor Prophets. 1 and 2 Chronicles (except the last few chaps. of 2 Ch.). K(ingdoms) α. K. ββ (2 K. i. 1—xi. 1). K. γγ (3 K. ii. 1—xxi. 43). Psalms. Sirach. Judith.
3.	Literal or unintelligent versions (style akin to that of Θ in many books)	Jeremiah β (xxix.—li.) with Baruch α (i. 1—iii. 8). Judges (B text) with Ruth. K. βγ with γδ (2 K. xi. 2—3 K. ii. 11: 3 K. xxii. and 4 K.). Song of Solomon. Lamentations. (Daniel Θ). (2 Esdras)[1]. (Ecclesiastes)[2].
	Paraphrases and free renderings.	
4.	Literary	1 Esdras with Daniel O (part). Esther. Job. Proverbs.
	Free Greek.	
5.	Literary and Atticistic	Wisdom. Ep. Jer. Baruch β (iii. 9—end). 2, 3 and 4 Maccabees.
6.	Vernacular	Tobit[3] (both B and ℵ texts).

A few notes are appended on some of the groups and individual books in the above list.

Class I. The Greek Pentateuch should undoubtedly be regarded as a unit: the Aristeas story may so far be credited that the Law or the greater part of it was translated *en bloc*, as a single undertaking, in the 3rd century B.C. There are renderings, not found, or rarely found, elsewhere in the LXX, but represented in all five books of the Pentateuch (e.g. ἐπανα-

[1] Possibly the work of Theodotion (as has been suggested by Sir H. Howorth). cf. p. xi

[2] The work of Aquila (see McNeile's edition).

[3] Should perhaps be placed under Paraphrases.

στρέφειν = שוב) or in three or four of them (e.g. δέομαι [δεόμεθα] κύριε = בי אדוני Gen. xliii. 20, xliv. 18, Ex. iv. 10, 13, N. xii. 11: contrast ἐν ἐμοὶ κύριε Jd. vi. 13, 15, xiii. 8, 1 K. i. 26, 3 K. iii. 17, 26: in Jos. vii. 8 the uncials omit the phrase, Syro-hex. ap. Field has δέομαι κύριε; cf. ἀποσκευή as the rendering of טף 'little children' in Gen., Ex., N., Dt.). Yet there are not wanting indications that even here there are different strata to be detected in the text of our uncials, notably in Ex. and Dt. The vocabulary of the latter part of Ex. presents some contrasts with that of the earlier part. In Dt. some new elements in the vocabulary begin to make their appearance (e.g. ἐκκλησία as the rendering of קהל = συναγωγή in the earlier books), particularly in the closing chapters where the abundance of novel features may be due to Hexaplaric influence. Joshua, as regards phraseology, forms a kind of link between the Pentateuch and the later historical books (cf. above p. 7 on θεράπων, παῖς): we may conjecture that the Greek version followed soon after that of the Law.

Class III. Jeremiah β contains the most glaring instances in the LXX of a translator who was ignorant of the meaning of the Hebrew, having recourse to Greek words of similar sound: αἴδε οἴδε = הידד "shout" xxxi. (xlviii.) 33, xxxii. 16 (xxv. 30), κειράδας = קיר חרש xxxi. (xlviii.) 31, 36, τιμωρίαν = תמרורים xxxviii. (xxxi.) 21, ἕως ᾅδου = הוי אדון "ah lord" xli. (xxxiv.) 5! This translator, moreover, has certain ἅπαξ λεγόμενα in vocabulary which place him in a class quite by himself.

The link which binds together the remaining members of this group (excluding Eccl.) is the resemblance of their style to that of Theodotion. Here we are met by a *crux* with regard to the text. This resemblance, which runs through a large portion of the later historical books, may be due to one of three causes. (1) It may be the result of *interpolations* from Θ into an original shorter text, affecting our oldest uncials, as in the book of Job. (2) The books or portions of books, which are marked by this resemblance, may be *wholly* the work of Θ, which has entirely replaced the earlier version, if such ever existed. (3) The original versions may have been written in a style afterwards employed by Θ. Taking the books of Kingdoms as a criterion, we find that the resemblances to Theodotion are confined mainly to the latter part of 2 K. and to 4 K. and within these limits they appear to extend over the whole narrative and not to be restricted to short paragraphs: there is no marked distinction between two totally different styles as there is in the Book of Job. In the Song and the Last Words of David (2 K. xxii. 2—xxiii. 7) the similarity to the language of Θ is specially marked, and quotations from Θ are for that section

absent from Field's Hexapla, and it may well be that these two songs are taken directly from Θ. Elsewhere, however, we have readings, differing from those of the LXX, attested as Theodotion's, and the fact has to be faced that Josephus was acquainted with these portions of the Greek Kingdoms in a text resembling that of our oldest uncials. The phenomena remind us of quotations from Daniel in the N.T. which agree with Theodotion's second century version: critics have in that case been forced to the conclusion that there must have been, in addition to the loose Alexandrian paraphrase, a third version, resembling that of Θ, but made before his time and in use in Palestine in the first century B.C. In the case of Kingdoms βδ a similar conclusion seems to be suggested, viz. that the bulk of this portion of the Greek Bible, if the text of the uncials is at all to be relied on, is a late production, falling between 100 B.C. and 100 A.D., written at a time when a demand for literal versions had arisen and in the style which was afterwards adopted by Theodotion.

Class IV. The most noticeable fact about the books in this class is that they all belong to the third division of the Hebrew Canon (the Kethubim). The prohibition to alter or add to or subtract from Scripture[1] was not felt to be binding in the case of writings which had not yet become canonized. To this cause is due the appearance of these free renderings of extracts with legendary additions at a time when the tendency was all in the direction of stricter adherence in translation to the original Hebrew. When the third portion of the Hebrew Canon was finally closed at the end of the first century of our era, more accurate and complete renderings were required. Thus we have a free rendering of parts of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah grouped round a fable (1 Esdras) and by the same hand a similar paraphrase of parts of Daniel, also with legendary additions: Esther has been treated after the same fashion. The original version of Job omitted large portions of the original. The Greek Book of Proverbs includes maxims and illustrations derived from extraneous sources, and metrical considerations[2] sometimes outweigh in the translator's mind faithfulness to his original. Even the Psalms, the most careful piece of work in the Greek collection of "Writings," has an Appendix (ψ cli.). Ben Sira may have specially had in mind some of these paraphrases when he wrote in his Prologue that *αὐτὸς ὁ νόμος καὶ αἱ προφητεῖαι καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν βιβλίων οὐ μικρὰν ἔχει τὴν διαφορὰν*

[1] Dt. iv. 2, xii. 32: cf. Aristeas, § 310 f. (p. 572 Swete *Introd.*).

[2] The number of fragments of hexameter and iambic verse in this book cannot be accidental: possibly the first version or versions were wholly in verse. Cf. the hexameter collection of maxims of pseudo-Phocylides.

ἐν ἑαυτοῖς λεγόμενα. Those words need not, of course, imply a *complete* collection of Greek versions of the prophecies and "writings" in 133 B.C., and in the case of Proverbs the consensus of the MSS as to the orthography of one word[1] suggests a date not much earlier than 100 B.C.

§ 3. The κοινή—the Basis of Septuagint Greek.

The Septuagint, considered as a whole, is the most extensive work which we possess written in the vernacular of the *κοινή* or Hellenistic language, and is therefore of primary importance for a study of later Greek, and the main function of a grammar of LXX Greek is to serve as a contribution to the larger subject, the grammar of the *κοινή*. That is the conclusion which, if not wholly new, has been strongly emphasized by the large increase in our knowledge of the *κοινή* brought about by the new-found Egyptian papyri. The LXX, being a translation, has naturally a Semitic colouring, but the occurrence in the papyri of many phrases which have hitherto been regarded as purely "Hebraisms" has compelled us to reconsider the extent of that influence. The isolated position which "Biblical Greek" has until recently occupied can no longer be maintained: "it has," as Dr J. H. Moulton says, "now been brought out into the full stream of progress[2]." The value of the LXX as a thesaurus of *κοινή* Greek has been proportionately increased.

The *κοινὴ διάλεκτος* is a term which has been used in different senses. We shall probably not be far wrong in adopting the definition of it given by the man who has done more than any other to promote a study of it and to point the way to its correct appreciation, namely Dr Thumb. He defines it as "the sum-total of the development of the Greek of common and commercial speech from the time of Alexander the Great to the close of ancient history[3]." The term, thus widely

[1] *Οὐδείς* (not *οὐθείς*): see § 5.
[2] *Prol.* 2.
[3] *Hell.* 7.

defined, embraces both the vernacular κοινή and the literary κοινή of Polybius, Josephus and other educated writers, which, as Dr Thumb says, should be regarded as an offshoot of the vernacular. The translations contained in the LXX belong to the vernacular class, but it includes also some specimens of the literary κοινή (e.g. Wisdom).

The κοινή is the speech which replaced the old dialects of the mother-land, when Greece lost her political independence but bequeathed her language to the ancient world. The main cause of the dissemination of the Greek language and its establishment as the recognised language of intercourse was the victorious march of Alexander. But the Greek which was thus diffused was not the Attic of Demosthenes. Dialectical differences could not maintain their hold in the motley host of which Alexander's army was composed. But the fusion of the dialects had begun even before then. Aristotle, and still earlier Xenophon, are precursors of the κοινή. The mixture of clans during the long marches across Asia under the latter's leadership had on a small scale much the same effects of breaking down the barriers which the mountains of Greece had erected between tribe and tribe, and of diffusing an international language, as were afterwards produced by Alexander's campaign. Commerce had, even before Xenophon's time, brought about a certain interchange of the Attic and Ionic dialects. Out of this fusion arose the κοινὴ διάλεκτος, in which the Attic dialect of the people which had won its way to the front rank in politics, literature and the arts naturally formed the main constituent. But the Attic basis of the κοινή was not the Attic of the Greek literary masterpieces. The vulgar language, which had existed beside the literary language, but had not gained an entrance into it, except in Comedy, now forces its way to the front, and makes itself felt in the diction of historians and philosophers. Next to Attic in importance as a formative element in the κοινή is Ionic, which provides a large part of its vocabulary and, in

particular, a considerable stock of words hitherto restricted to poetry. The other dialects appear to have played but a small part in the creation of the cosmopolitan language.

Now, one important fact to notice about the κοινή is that it appears for at least the first few centuries of its existence to have been a language practically without dialects. The old dialects lived on for a short time beside the new speech in some districts (Ionic on the sea-board of Asia Minor, Doric in Rhodes). But they soon had to give way before the levelling process which was at work. It seems to be an assured result of philological criticism that with a single exception (that of the old Laconic, which still held its own in the fastnesses of the Peloponnesus, and survives in the modern Zaconic) none of the old dialects survived in the competition with the κοινή, and that from it all the dialects of modern Greece, with the one exception mentioned, are descended. The κοινή was the resultant of a process of merging and amalgamation, and was the starting-point for a fresh dialectical differentiation. It was, of course, not entirely uniform; there was a period during which there was a struggle for the survival of the fittest, and two forms were in existence side by side. Some forms, such as οὐθείς, were "transitional," having a life of a few centuries only, and then passing out of existence. In other cases the competition between two forms has continued down to modern times. On what grounds, it may be asked, is it held that the κοινή was a language without dialectic differences? The sources of our knowledge of the κοινή in order of importance are: (1) the papyri, (2) the inscriptions, (3) the Hellenistic writers such as Polybius, (4) modern Greek. The papyri are, unfortunately, with the exception of the Herculaneum collection, limited to Egypt, for which district we now have abundant materials, extending over a millennium (300 B.C.—700 A.D.), for a study of the language of every-day life as spoken by persons of all ranks in the social scale. But the inscriptions extend over the whole

Greek-speaking world, and through the industry of German scholars we are now able to compare the κοινή as written in some of the different districts. The inscriptions give us a slightly higher order of Greek than the uneducated vernacular found in the letters and other writings, intended for ephemeral purposes only, which make up the papyri. But the results obtained, speaking generally, from the study of inscriptions and Hellenistic writings is that the same principles were at work and the same forms employed, at least so far as orthography and accidence are concerned[1], throughout the Greek-speaking world during the first three centuries before our era.

The foregoing remarks might seem to be disproved by the fact that two grammarians[2] in the time of Augustus wrote treatises, now unfortunately lost, on "the dialect of the Alexandrians." But when we find forms like ἐλήλυθαν cited by ancient writers as Alexandrian, which we now know to have had a much wider circulation within the κοινή, we have good reason to question the accuracy of the titles which Irenaeus (Minutius Pacatus) and Demetrius Ixion gave to their works. The probability is that they took too limited a view: as Dr Thumb says[3]: "they recognised the distinction between the colloquial language with which they were familiar and the literary dialects which they studied, but overlooked the fact that the Alexandrian vernacular was only one branch of a great linguistic development, and consequently failed to grasp clearly the points of difference between the Alexandrian idiom and the rest of the κοινή." It is certain that many forms of the later language were specially *characteristic* of Alexandria, and some (e.g. such forms as are common to Codices ℵ and A but absent from Cod. B) may have been rarely used outside

[1] These are the tests most easily applied: the tests of vocabulary and syntax have not yet been worked out.

[2] Swete *Introd.* 289.

[3] *Hellenismus* 171.

Egypt. But we are not in a position to draw a hard and fast line between what was specially Alexandrian, or rather Egyptian, and what was not. Specifically Egyptian traits are probably to be looked for rather in the region of phonetics (in the mixture of τ and δ, κ and γ, the omission of intervocalic γ, and the interchange of certain vowels) than in accidence and syntax[1]. With regard to the phrase "the Alexandrian dialect," we must further remember the position which Alexandria occupied in the Hellenistic world, both as the centre of literary culture and (through the constant influx of persons of all nationalities) as the principal agent in the consolidation and dissemination of the cosmopolitan speech. Such a metropolis might not unnaturally give its name to a dialect which was spread over a far wider area.

A question closely connected with that of dialectical differences in the *κοινή* is the question how far it was influenced by the native languages of the countries which used it. The question is important, as bearing on the "Hebraisms" of the LXX. The foreign influence seems to have been extremely small. In the Ptolemaic papyri Mayser[2] finds no more than 23 words which are "probably Egyptian": 14 only of these are words which are unknown to the older literature. Only a single instance of Coptic syntactical influence has been discovered in the whole papyrus collection[3]. The contribution of the indigenous languages of Asia to the *κοινή* vocabulary appears to be equally negligible[4]. Latin alone brought a relatively large number of words into the common stock: but its influence on the grammar was quite slight. The general impression produced is that the resistance which Greek offered to the intru-

[1] Thumb *op. cit.* 133 ff.

[2] *Gramm. der Griechischen Papyri* 35—39.

[3] *Ὄνος ὑπὸ οἴνου* = "an ass laden with wine" and the like: Thumb, op. cit. 124. There are several examples of *ὄνος ὑπὸ δένδρα* in *BU.* 362 (215 A.D.).

[4] Thumb *op. cit.* 119.

sion of foreign elements was much the same in the Hellenistic period as in the age of Pericles[1]. The Greek language was at all times the giver rather than the receiver[2], and when it borrowed it usually clothed its loans in a dress of its own making.

The κοινή has often been unduly disparaged by comparison with the classical language. It has only in recent years come to be considered worthy of serious study, and its investigation on scientific lines is yet in its infancy. How much light may be thrown on its vocabulary and grammar by a study of modern Greek, which is its lineal descendant, has been shown by the researches of Thumb and others. The gulf between modern Greek and that, e.g., of the N.T. is in some respects not much wider than that which separates the latter from Attic. The κοινή is not estimated at its true worth when regarded merely as a debased and decadent Greek. Though it abandoned many of the niceties of the older language, it has some new laws of its own. It does not represent the last stages of the language, but a starting-point for fresh development. The resources which it shows in enriching the vocabulary are amazing. It evolves distinct meanings out of two different spellings of a single word. Simplification, uniformity, lucidity (together with a disregard of literary style[3])—these may be said to be the dominant characteristics of the κοινή vernacular. Analogy plays an important part in their production. "Lucidity," it is true, is not a conspicuous feature of many of the translations in the LXX: but that is due to the hampering fetters of the original[4].

[1] Thumb *op. cit.* 158.

[2] Witness the long list of Greek words found in Rabbinical writings, collected by Krauss *Griechische und Lat. Lehnwörter in Talmud Midrasch und Targum.*

[3] This of course does not apply, without considerable reservation, to the literary writers and the Atticists.

[4] Dr Swete speaks of "the success with which syntax is set aside [in the Apocalypse] without loss of perspicuity or even of literary power," *Apoc.* p. cxx.

The following are some of the principal features in the κοινή which may be illustrated from the LXX.

Orthography. Attic ττ is replaced by σσ, except in a few words (ἐλάττων, ἧττων, κρείττων, with derivatives) in which both forms are found, and in Atticistic writings (e.g. 4 Macc.). Οὐθείς (=οὐδ-ἑ-εἰς) is the prevailing form down to about 100 B.C. Among the vowel-changes which begin to appear in the Ptolemaic period mention may be made of the tendency to weaken α to ε especially when in proximity with ρ (τεσσεράκοντα, μερός, etc.). The shortening of -ιει- to -ει- (e.g. ταμεῖον), though strongly attested in the LXX MSS, appears from the papyri to be hardly older than the first century A.D. There is a tendency to drop the aspirate, while in a few cases, partly under the influence of false analogy, it is inserted where not required. The desire to keep individual words and the elements of words distinct appears to account on the one hand for the avoidance of elision, especially with proper names (ἀπὸ Αἰγύπτου, not ἀπ' Αἰγ.), on the other for the want of assimilation within words (συνκόπτειν, not συγκ. etc.). The reverse process, the extension of assimilation to two separate words is, however, found in the early Ptolemaic papyri (ἐμμέσῳ, mainly in Cod. A, is almost the only LXX instance of this). The increasing tendency to insert variable final ν and ς (e.g. in ἐστίν, οὕτως) before consonants as well as vowels marks a loss of feeling for rhythm.

Accidence. The cases of nouns of the first declension in -ρᾰ are brought into line with other nouns in this declension (μαχαίρης not -ρας etc.). The "Attic" second declension is obsolescent: ναύς replaces νεώς. In the third declension an assimilation to the first is seen in forms like νύκταν (in LXX almost confined, however, to ℵA, and their originality is doubtful). The most striking example of the casting off of luxuries is the disappearance of the dual, which not even the fact that analogous forms in the Hebrew had to be rendered could recall into life. Other words expressing duality are also on the way to extinction. Adjectives formerly taking two terminations are used with three: a form like αἰσχρότερος (Gen. xli. 19) is another instance of analogy at work. The same cause produces the declension πᾶν (for πάντα, on the model of μέγαν)—πᾶσαν —πᾶν. Πλήρης is commonly used indeclinably. Ἀσεβῆν etc. (mainly in ℵA) are the natural sequel to νύκταν etc. Δεκάδυο for δώδεκα appears to be due to a preference for placing the larger number first as when symbols are used (ιβ′): similarly δεκατέσσαρες etc. are preferred to τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα etc. Ὅς ἐάν begins to oust ὃς ἄν in the last quarter of the first century B.C. and remains the predominant form for several centuries: its *raison*

d'être is not clear. In the verb the most salient innovations are (1) the transference of *-μι* verbs, with certain reservations, to the *-ω* class, (2) the formation of new presents, *ἀποκτέννω*, *ἀποχύ(ν)νω*, *-κρύβω*, *-λιμπάνω*, and the like, (3) the tendency of the "weak" aorist terminations to supplant the older "strong" forms, *εἶπα*, *ἦλθα*, *ἔπεσα* etc. The same preference for the 1 aor. termination is seen in forms like *ἤλθοσαν* (which are curiously rare in Jd.—4 K., though frequent in the Hexateuch and other parts of the LXX). The intrusion of the 1 aor. termination into the 3rd plur. of the impf. (*ἀνέβαιναν*) and perf. (*ἑώρακαν*) was apparently a later development and is rarely attested in LXX. The syllabic augment is dropped in the pluperfect, and duplicated in some verbs compounded with prepositions: the temporal augment is also liable to omission (*εὐλόγησα*).

Syntax. In the breach of the rules of concord is seen the widest deviation from classical orthodoxy. The evidence which the LXX affords for a relaxation of the rigorous requirements of Attic Greek in this respect is fully borne out by the contemporary papyri. Instances in LXX of "nominativus pendens" and of what may be described as "drifting into the nominative (or accusative)" in a long series of dependent words connected by *καί* are frequent. The nom. (the name case) is the usual case for proper names after *καλεῖν* (Gen. iii. 20 *ἐκάλεσεν...τὸ ὄνομα τῆς γυναικὸς Ζωή* etc.). "Constructio ad sensum" plays a large part, e.g. in the extended use of *πᾶς*, *ἕκαστος* etc. with a plural verb. *Λέγων*, *λέγοντες* are used without construction in phrases like *ἀπηγγέλη λέγοντες*, very much like our inverted commas or the *ὅτι* which often introduces direct speech in Hellenistic (and Attic) Greek. Neuter plurals may take either a singular or a plural verb: this gives scope for some distinctions unknown to classical Greek.

The extended use of the genitive of quality equivalent to an adj., is partly but not altogether due to literal translation. (The dative, which has disappeared in modern Greek, shows but little sign of waning as yet.) As regards comparison of the adj., a common substitute for the comparative is the positive followed by *παρά*: though the Heb. גדול מן is partly answerable for this, it is noticeable that the preposition *ἀπό* is hardly ever used in the Greek, though in the modern language e.g. *μεγαλύτερος ἀπό* has become the normal phrase[1]. The superlative is waning (forms in *-έστατος* are almost confined to two or three literary LXX books) and usually has *elative* sense (esp. *μέγιστος*, *πλεῖστος*). The general Hellenistic rule that the comparative does duty for both degrees of comparison is reversed in the case of

[1] Thumb *Handbuch der Neugr. Volkssprache* 52.

πρῶτος which in LXX, as elsewhere in the κοινή, stands for πρότερος. As regards pronouns, the otiose insertion of the oblique cases of αὐτός is shown by the papyri to be a Hellenistic feature, though the frequency of the usage in LXX comes from the Heb. Ἑαυτούς, -ῶν, -οῖς are used of all three persons of the plural, supplanting ὑμᾶς (ἡμ.) αὐτούς: a transitional form ὑμῖν ἑαυτοῖς occurs in the Hexateuch.

The use of intransitive verbs with a causative sense is remarkable: verbs in -εύειν and compounds of ἐκ afford most of the examples (βασιλεύειν "to make king," ἐξαμαρτάνειν "to cause to sin"): the limitation of the verbs affected indicates that the influence of the Heb. hiphil is not the sole cause. The historic present tends to be used with verbs of a certain class; apart from λέγει etc. it is specially used of verbs of seeing in the Pentateuch, of verbs of motion (coming and going) in the later historical books: its absence from K. βδ distinguishes the later from the earlier portions of the Kingdom books. A few perfects are used as aorists; εἴληφα Dan. Θ iv. 30b, ἔσχηκα 3 Macc. v. 20: papyri of the second and first centuries B.C. attest the aoristic use of both words. The periphrastic conjugation is widely extended, but only the strong vernacular of Tobit employs such a future as ἔσομαι διδόναι (v. 15 B text). The optative almost disappears from dependent clauses (its frequency in 4 Macc. is the most obvious of the Atticisms in that book): besides its primary use to express a wish there are several exx., principally in Dt., of its use in comparisons after ὡς εἰ (ὡς). The infinitive (under the influence of the Heb. ל)[1] has a very wide range: the great extension of the inf. with τοῦ, alternating with the anarthrous inf., is a prominent feature: a tendency is observable in some portions to reserve the anarthrous inf. of purpose to verbs of motion (coming, going, sending). The substitution for the inf. of a clause with ἵνα is quite rare: the Heb. had no corresponding use. (The use of the conjunctive participle is yielding to the coordination of sentences with καί, largely under Heb. influence: it is not clear whether the use of the part. for a finite verb in descriptive clauses such as Jd. iv. 16 καὶ Βαρὰκ διώκων... "and B. was pursuing" is wholly "Hebraic.") The genitive absolute construction is freely used where the noun or pronoun occurs in another case in the same sentence.

The tendency, where a genitive is dependent on another noun, to use the article with both or with neither on the principle of "correlation" is exemplified outside "Biblical Greek," but the consistent omission of the art. in such a phrase, even where it forms the subject of the sentence, as in 1 K. (e.g.

[1] To the Heb. is due an enlarged use of the "epexegetic infinitive."

iv. 5 ἦλθεν κιβωτὸς Κυρίου, cf. v. 1 καὶ ἀλλόφυλοι ἔλαβον) appears to be wholly due to imitation, the Heb. art. being an impossibility with nouns in the construct state.

Under the head of prepositions the chief innovations are (1) the partial or total disuse of one of the cases after prepositions which in Classical Greek take more than a single case, (2) the supplementing of the old stock of prepositions proper by adverbs, adverbial phrases and prepositions: ἐναντίον ἐνώπιον etc. (for πρό), ἐπάνω (for ἐπί), ἐπάνωθεν ἀπάνωθεν ὑπεράνω (for ὑπέρ), ὑποκάτω (for ὑπό), ἀνὰ μέσον (for μεταξύ), κύκλῳ περικύκλῳ (for περί), ἐχόμενος etc. (for παρά). Modern Greek has several similar forms. Possibly it was thought necessary in this way to distinguish the old local sense of the prepositions from the metaphorical meanings which subsequently became attached to them. Among many new details the use of ὑπέρ for περί may be noticed. Ἐν and εἰς are on the whole still carefully discriminated: the use of ἐν for εἰς after verbs of motion is characteristic of the vernacular style of Tobit (i. 6, v. 5, vi. 6, ix. 2) and of Jd.—4 K. (= ב): ultimately εἰς alone survived. Among particles mention may here be made of the prominence given to such a phrase as ἀνθ' ὧν = "because," owing to the Heb. having similar conjunctions formed with the relative אשר: in the latest translations this is extended to ἄνθ' ὧν ὅτι, ἄνθ' ὧν ὅσα etc.

The foregoing is a brief conspectus of some salient features of the κοινή which appear in the LXX: a more detailed investigation of these and kindred innovations will be made in the body of this work.

The vocabulary of the LXX would require, if fully discussed, a volume to itself. The reader must be referred to the useful work done in this department by Kennedy[1] and Anz[2] and to the lists of words given in Dr Swete's *Introduction*[3].

§ 4. The Semitic Element in LXX Greek.

The extent to which the Greek of the Old and New Testaments has been influenced by Hebrew and Aramaic has long been a subject of discussion among grammarians and

[1] *Sources of N.T. Greek* or *The Influence of the LXX on the vocabulary of the N.T.*, Edinburgh, 1895.

[2] *Subsidia ad cognoscendum Graecorum sermonem vulgarem e Pentateuchi versione Alex. repetita*, Halle, 1894.

[3] 302 ff., 310 ff.

theologians. The old controversy between the Hebraist School, who discovered Hebraisms in Greek colloquial expressions, and the Purists who endeavoured to bring every peculiarity under the strict rules of Attic grammar, has given way to a general recognition that the basis of the language of the Greek Bible is the vernacular employed throughout the whole Greek-speaking world since the time of Alexander the Great. The number of "Hebraisms" formerly so-called has been reduced by phenomena in the papyri, the importance of which Deissmann was the first to recognise: his investigations, chiefly on the lexical side, have been followed up by Dr J. H. Moulton, who has carried his papyri researches into grammatical details, with the result that anything which has ever been termed a "Hebraism" at once arouses his suspicion. It is no doubt possible that further discoveries may lead to the detection in non-Jewish writings of parallels to other Hebrew modes of expression, and that the category of acknowledged "Hebraisms" (for which no parallel exists in the vernacular) will be still further depleted.

But the emphasis which has been laid upon the occurrence of certain words and usages in the Egyptian papyri which are exactly equivalent to, or bear a fairly close resemblance to, phrases in the Greek Bible hitherto regarded as "Hebraic" is likely to create a false impression, especially as regards the nature of the Semitic element in the LXX.

What results have actually been gained? It may be said, in the first place, that the papyri and the more scientific study of the κοινή, which has been promoted by their discovery, and the recognition of the fact that it was quickly adopted the whole world over, that it had little or no dialectic differentiation and was proof against the intrusion of foreign elements to any considerable extent, have given the death-blow to, or at any rate have rendered extremely improbable, the theory once held of the existence of a "Jewish-Greek" jargon, in use in the Ghettos of Alexandria and other centres where Jews congregated. The

Greek[1] papyri have little to tell us about the private life of the Jews of Egypt: they hardly figure among the correspondents whose letters have come down to us. The marshes of the Delta, less favourable than the sands of Upper Egypt, have not preserved for us the every-day writings of inhabitants of Alexandria, the chief centre of the Jewish colony and the birthplace of the oldest Greek version of the Scriptures. Yet we need have little hesitation in assuming that the conditions which applied to the Egyptians and Arabs, who wrote good *κοινή* Greek with little or no admixture of elements derived from their native speech, held good of the Jews as well. The "peculiar people" were not exempt from the influences at work elsewhere. The Greek of the LXX does not give a true picture of the language of ordinary intercourse between Jewish residents in the country. It is not, of course, denied that they had a certain stock of terms, such as *ἀκροβυστία*[2] and the like, which would only be intelligible within their own circle: but the extent of Semitic influence on the Greek language appears to have been limited to a small vocabulary of words expressing peculiarly Semitic ideas or institutions. The influence of Semitism on the syntax of the Jewish section of the Greek-speaking world was probably almost as inappreciable as its syntactical influence on the *κοινή* as a whole, an influence which may be rated at zero.

One of the strongest arguments which may be adduced to disprove the existence of "Jewish-Greek" as a separate dialectical entity is the striking contrast between the unfettered original Greek writings of Jewish authorship and the translations contained in the Greek Bible. Of primary importance is the difference in style noticeable when we pass from the preface of the son of Sirach to his version of his grandfather's work—a contrast which is analogous to that between Luke's preface

[1] As opposed to the new-found early Aramaic papyri from Assuan.

[2] *Ἀνάθεμα* 'curse' has been found in 'profane Greek': J. H. Moulton *Prol.* 46, note 3.

and his story of the Infancy. The same contrast is felt on passing from the paraphrases (e.g. 1 Esdras) or original writings (3 Macc.) of the LXX to the version of e.g. the Pentateuch, or from the allegories and expositions of Philo to the LXX text which he incorporates in his commentary. The fact that "Hebraisms" are practically a nonentity in the Greek translation of his *Jewish War* which Josephus made from the Aramaic original points to the same conclusion. Philo and Josephus present us, it is true, with the literary κοινή, but too sharp a line of demarcation should not be drawn between that species and the vernacular variety, and Jewish-Greek, if it existed, could hardly fail to have left some traces even in such literary writers as these. The book of Tobit (not e.g. 4 Kingdoms) is probably the best representative in the Greek Bible of the vernacular as spoken by Jews.

The Hellenization of Egypt appears to have been rapid and to have affected all classes of the community, at least in Lower Egypt: towards the South it made less headway. The majority of the Jewish residents probably had a greater knowledge of the κοινή Greek than of the original language of their sacred writings. It must be remembered, too, that so far as they employed a second language, that language was not Hebrew but Aramaic. The word used for a "proselyte" in the early versions of Exodus and Isaiah[1] (γειώρας from Aram. גִּיּוֹרָא, Heb. גֵּר) is significant. The mere fact that a Greek translation was called for at all, taken together with the large number of transliterations in some of the later historical books, indicates a want of familiarity, which increased as time went on, with the original Hebrew. The primary purpose which, in all probability, the translation was intended to serve was not to enrich the library of Ptolemy Philadelphus, nor to extend an acquaintance with the Scriptures to the non-Jewish world, but to supply a version that would be intelligible to the Greek-speaking Jew

[1] The later books use πάροικος or προσήλυτος.

when read in the ordinary services of the synagogue. That the desired intelligibility was not always successfully attained was due to the conflicting claims of a growing reverence for the letter of Scripture, which resulted in the production of literal versions of ever-increasing baldness.

Notwithstanding that certain so-called "Hebraisms" have been removed from that category or that their claim to the title has become open to question, it is impossible to deny the existence of a strong Semitic influence in the Greek of the LXX. The papyri have merely modified our ideas as to the extent and nature of that influence. Dr J. H. Moulton has been the first to familiarize us with the view, to which he frequently recurs[1], that the "Hebraism" of Biblical writings consists in the *over-working* of and the special prominence given to certain correct, though unidiomatic, modes of speech, because they happen to coincide with Hebrew idioms. His happy illustration of the overdoing of ἰδού in Biblical Greek by the "look you" which is always on the lips of the Welshman in Shakespeare's *Henry V* is very telling. This view appears to the present writer to be borne out to a great extent by the linguistic phenomena of the LXX, at least as regards the Pentateuch and some other of the earlier versions. The Hebraic character of these books consists in the *accumulation* of a number of just tolerable Greek phrases, which nearly correspond to what is normal and idiomatic in Hebrew. If we take these phrases individually, we can discover isolated parallels to them in the papyri, but in no document outside the Bible or writings directly dependent upon it do we find them in such profusion. The κοινή Greek was characterized by a striving after simplification. Greek was on the road to becoming rather an analytical than a synthetical language. The tendency was in the direction of the more primitive and child-like simplicity of Oriental speech. And so it happened that the translators of the

[1] *Prol.* 10 f., 72 etc.

Pentateuch found ready to their hand many phrases and modes of speech in the current vernacular which resembled the Hebrew phrases which they had to render. These phrases they adopted, and by so doing gave them a far wider currency and circulation than they had hitherto possessed: the later translators took the Greek Pentateuch for their model, and from the Greek Bible these "Hebraisms" passed into the pages of some N.T. writers (Luke in particular) who made a study of the LXX.

It is, however, only with considerable reservations that we can apply the theory of overworked vernacular Greek usages to some of the "Hebraisms" of the *later* LXX books. The distinction between the earlier and the later books is a real one; the reason for the change is to be sought, it appears, rather in a growing reverence for the letter of the Hebrew than in ignorance of Greek. There are well-marked limits to the literalism of the Pentateuch translators. Seldom do they imitate a Hebrew locution without adapting and accommodating it in some way to the spirit of the Greek language, if they fail to find an exact equivalent in the vernacular. On the other hand, the translators of the Kingdom books (especially of the portion $\beta\delta$) were prepared to sacrifice style and to introduce a considerable number of phrases, for which parallels never, probably, existed in the *κοινή*, if Greek did not furnish them with a close enough parallel to the Hebrew. The demand for strict accuracy increased as time went on, and the prohibition against any alteration of the words of Scripture[1] was taken by the translators as applying to the smallest minutiae in the Hebrew, until the tendency towards literalism culminated in the ἐγώ εἰμι ἔχω of Kingdoms ($\beta\delta$) and the ἐν ἀρχῇ ἔκτισεν ὁ θεὸς σὺν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ σὺν τὴν γῆν of Aquila. In the later period the books whose right to a place in the Canon had not yet been finally determined came off best in the matter of

[1] See note 1 on p. 15.

style, because paraphrase was here possible and the hampering necessity of adhering to the original was not felt. Had Ecclesiastes been translated before the time of Christ, we should no doubt have had a translation very different from that which now stands in our Septuagint. The discussion which follows of some principal "Hebraisms" of the LXX will illustrate the contrast between the earlier and later periods.

Hebraisms in Vocabulary.

The influence of Hebrew on the vocabulary of the LXX, though considerable, is not so great as might at first sight be supposed. Apart from a small group of words expressing peculiarly Hebrew ideas or institutions (weights, measures, feasts etc.), the instances where the Hebrew word is merely transliterated in Greek letters are mainly confined to a single group, namely the later historical books (Jd.—2 Chron., 2 Esdras). Now this is a group in which we have frequent reason to suspect, in the text of our uncials, the influence of Theodotion, and at least one book in the group (2 Esdras) has with much probability been considered to be entirely his work. We know that Theodotion was, whether from ignorance of the Hebrew or in some cases from scrupulousness, specially addicted to transliteration[1], and many of the instances in the later historical books are probably derived from him. Where there are doublets (transliteration appearing side by side with translation) the latter is doubtless to be regarded as the original text: the former has probably crept in either from the second column of the Hexapla (the Heb. transliterated) or from the sixth (Theodotion). On the other hand, the earlier translators for the most part rendered every word in the original, going so far as to translate the names of places. Transliteration is rare in the Pentateuch, Isaiah, Jeremiah α and the Minor Prophets. It is

[1] See Swete's *Introduction* 46, with the list in Field's *Hexapla* I. p. xl f.

entirely absent from Ezekiel β, the Psalter (excepting the titles and the word ἀλληλουιά), Proverbs, Job (excluding the Θ portions) and most of "the writings."

A distinction must be drawn between words which are merely transliterated and treated in their Greek form as indeclinables, and the smaller class of Hellenized Hebrew words. The majority of the latter words had gained an entrance into the Greek vocabulary before the time when the LXX was written. The transliterations may be divided into (*a*) ideas, institutions etc. peculiar to Judaism, for which Greek afforded no exact equivalent, (*b*) geographical terms, e.g. ἀραβά, ἀραβώθ, to which may be added cases where an appellative has been mistaken for a proper name, (*c*) words of the meaning of which the translators were ignorant, (*d*) doublets. Hellenized Hebrew words mainly come under class (*a*). The Pentateuch instances of transliteration and Hellenized words are mainly restricted to this class, which also comprises most of the words which are repeatedly used in different parts of the LXX.

The Pentateuch examples of transliteration are as follows, arranged under classes (*a*), (*b*) and (*d*): there are no certain examples of (*c*).

(*a*)[1] γόμορ (=עמר "an omer") Ex. xvi. 16 etc.: also used in Hos. iii. 2, Ez. xlv. 11 etc. of the different dry measure חמר "an homer" (which is rendered in Pent. and Ez. xlv. 13 by κόρος), and so apparently in 1 K. xvi. 20 (M. T. חמור "an ass"), cf. xxv. 18 (M. T. כאה): in 4 K v. 17 γόμος should apparently be read (cf. Ex. xxiii. 5), where the corruption γόμορ indicates familiarity with this transliteration—εἶν (ἶν)=הין, a liquid measure, Ex. Lev. N. Ez.—μάν Ex. xvi. 31 ff. and μάννα N. Dt. Jos. 2 Es. Ψ =מן—οἰφί (οἰφεί)=איפה, אפה Lev. N. Jd. R. 1 K. Ez., once (1 K. xxv. 18) corresponding to another measure in the M. T., סאה—πάσχα, פסח, Hex. 4 K. 1 2 Es. Ez.: a different transliteration, φάσεκ or φάσεχ, occurs in 2 Ch. and Jer. xxxviii. 8—

[1] ἄχι (=Heb. אֲחוּ Gen. xli. 2 etc.) is an Egyptianism rather than a Hebraism: it renders other Hebrew words in Isaiah and Sirach. See Sturz, p. 88, BDB Heb. Lexicon s.v.

σίκερα, שכר intoxicating drink, Lev. N. Dt. Jd. Is. (elsewhere rendered by *μέθυσμα*, *μέθη*)—*χερούβ* plur. *χερουβ(ε)ίν* (rarely *-β(ε)ίμ*) LXX *passim*.

(*b*) Ἀραβά, *ἀραβώθ* N. Dt. Jos. etc.—Ἀσηδώθ (אשדת the "slopes" of Pisgah) Dt. Jos. Other exx. of appellatives being treated as proper names are Μάσεκ Gen. xv. 2, Οὐλαμμαύς ib. xxviii. 19 (=אולם לוז), so Jd. xviii. 29 B Οὐλαμαίς, τὸν Ἰαμείν Gen. xxxvi. 24, Σίκιμα xlviii. 22, Μεισώρ ("plain") Dt. Jos., Ἐμεκαχώρ ("valley of Achor") Jos. vii. 24 etc.

(*d*) Of this class Genesis supplies one example in xxii. 13 (*ἐν φυτῷ*) *σαβέκ*: probably also the word *χαβραθά* in xxxv. 16, xlviii. 7 is a doublet (cf. 4 K. v. 19 *δεβραθά*). Ὀμμόθ in N. xxv. 15 (*ἔθνους Ὀμμοθ*=אמות) may also belong to this class.

The following transliterations occur in more than one of the later books, the words being translated in the Pentateuch or elsewhere.

Γεδδούρ=גדוד "a troop" 1 K. 1 Ch. (elsewhere rendered by *λῃστήριον*, *λῃστής*, *μονόζωνος* etc.)—Ἐφούδ *ἐφώδ* Jd. 1 K. (Pent. *ἐπωμίς*, 2 K. vi. 14, 1 Ch. xv. 27 *στολή*)—*Θεραφείν θαραφείν θεραπείν* (once Hellenized into *θεραπείαν* 1 K. xv. 23 B) Jd. 1 K. 4 K. 2 Ch. (elsewhere *τὰ εἴδωλα* Gen. xxxi. 19 etc., *κενοτάφια* 1 K. xix. 13, 16, *τὰ γλυπτά* Ez. xxi. 21, *δῆλοι* Hos. iii. 4)—Μαναά, *μαανά*, *μανάχ*, *μάννα* etc.=מנחה "a present" or "sacrifice," 4 K. 2 Ch. 2 Es. Ez. Dan. Θ (elsewhere constantly rendered by *δῶρον* or *θυσία*)—Ναγέβ=נגב Jos. Ob. Jer. *β* Ez. *a* (elsewhere translated *ἔρημος*, *λίψ*, *μεσημβρία*, *νότος*)—Νέβελ=נֵבֶל a "wine-skin" or "jar" (elsewhere *ἀγγεῖον*, *ἀσκός*)—Σαβαώθ 1 K. and Is. (elsewhere *τῶν δυνάμεων* or Παντοκράτωρ)—Σεφηλά (elsewhere *ἡ πεδινή*, *γῆ πεδινή*, *τὰ ταπεινά*).

It is needless to enumerate other transliterations which, as already stated, are very frequent in the later historical books, especially in 4 K., 2 Ch. and 2 Es.

The Hebrew definite article sometimes forms part of the transliteration, e.g. *ἁβάκ* 1 Ch. iv. 21, *ἁβεδηρείν* ib. 22 (הדברים), *ἁμασενείθ* xv. 21 (this of course is to be expected where the word is a doublet and probably taken from the second column of the Hexapla, e.g. 1 K. v. 4 *ἁμαφέθ*). Sometimes the Greek article is prefixed to the Hebrew article and noun: Jd. viii. 7 B

ταῖς ἀβαρκηνείν, 2 Ch. xxv. 18 τὸν ἀχούχ. The Greek article occasionally stands in the singular with a plural noun: Jd. x. 10 B τῷ Βααλείμ, Ez. xxvii. 4 τῷ Βεελείμ, xl. 16 B τὸ θεείμ (contrast 12).

The following are examples of *Hellenized Semitic words* used in the LXX, i.e. the Greek form of the word is declinable. Some of them had been introduced into the Greek language before the time of the LXX and are ultimately derived from Phoenician.

Ἀρραβών -ῶνος=ערבון, Gen. (already used by Isaeus and Aristot., also in Ptolemaic papyri, probably Phoenician).

Βακχούρια neut. pl.=בכורים "first-fruits" 2 Es. xxiii. 31 (elsewhere, including 2 Es. xx. 35, rendered πρωτογενήματα).

Βάρις, plur. βάρεις βάρεων, from בירה "a palace," which as well as other words it renders in 2 Ch. 1 and 2 Es. Ψ Lam. Dan. Θ and in the later translators. Jerome states "verbum est ἐπιχώριον Palaestinae," and a Scholiast on Ψ cxxi. 7 (where the compound πυργόβαρις is used) makes a similar statement (see Schleusner s.v.). The Heb. is once transliterated, βειρά 2 Es. xvii. 2. (A word βᾶρις -ιδος meaning an Egyptian boat is found in Hdt. and Aesch., but is probably unconnected with the LXX word.) Cf. Sturz 89 f.

Βῖκος=בקבק "a wine-jar" Jer. xix. 1, 10 (first in Hdt. 1. 194 βίκους φοινικηίους, Ptolemaic pap.).

Βύσσος, βύσσινος render בוץ, from which they are derived, and other words (the adj. in Hdt. and Aesch.).

Γαζαρηνός Dan. ΟΘ appears to be formed from the Aram. plur. גזרין "soothsayers."

Γ(ε)ιώρας=גֵּר "a sojourner" or "proselyte" Ex. (ii. 22 ap. Philo *de conf. ling.* 17. 82) xii. 19, Is. xiv. 1 is noticeable as an instance of a Hellenized word formed not from the Hebrew but from the Aramaic גִּיּוֹרָא. (The Heb. is elsewhere rendered by πάροικος or προσήλυτος.)

Θῆβις, acc. -βιν dat. -βει,=תבה "a chest," Ex. ii. 3, 5, 6: the form θῖβις (not θίβη or θήβη) is that attested by the papyri where the word occurs as early as iii/B.C. (Mayser 42.)

[1] Κάβος=קב, a dry measure, 4 K. vi. 25.

Κασία=קציעה, a spice, Ψ xliv. 8: cf. Ez. xxvii. 17.

[1] כַּרְפַּס (rendered καρπασίνοις Est. i. 6) is a loan word from Sanskrit karpâsa (BDB Lexicon).

[The Semitic origin of *κιβωτός* (Aristoph. and earlier writers) is doubtful.]

Κιννάμωμον = קנמון "cinnamon" Ex. xxx. 23 etc., of Phoenician origin as Herodotus tells us, III. 111.

Κινύρα = כנור "a lyre" 1—3 K. 1—2 Ch. Sir. 1 M. (elsewhere rendered by *κιθάρα, ὄργανον, ψαλτήριον*).

Κόρος = כר, a Hebrew measure equivalent to the homer, twice in the Pentateuch corresponding to חמר of M. T., in 3 K. etc. = M. T. כר.

Κύμινον = כמן "cummin" Is. xxviii. 25, 27 (already in classical Greek, of Phoenician origin).

Λίβανος = לבנה "frankincense" (in class. Greek).

[*Μανδύας* renders מַד, מְדוּ (a garment) in Jd. 1—2 K. 1 Ch. (elsewhere rendered once by *χιτών* L. vi. 10, twice by *ἱμάτιον*). The word occurs in a fragment of Aeschylus, where it is used of a Liburnian dress: it is said to be Persian.][1]

[The Semitic origin of *μάρσιππος, μαρσίππιον* is doubtful.]

Μνᾶ = מנה a weight (classical Greek, probably introduced into the language through the Phoenicians).

Νάβλα = נֵבֶל, נָבֶל, a lute or other stringed instrument, 1—3 K. 1—2 Ch. 1 M. (in 1 K. x. 5 B *νάβαλ*): the Heb. is elsewhere rendered by *ψαλτήριον* Is. 2 Es. Ψ Sir., *κιθάρα* Ψ lxx. 2, *ὄργανον* Am. *Νάβλα* occurs in a fragment of Sophocles (Dindorf 728) and seems to have come from Phoenicia. (The transliteration *νέβελ* is kept for נֵבֶל = a wine-jar, see above.)

Νάρδος = נֵרְדְּ (already in Theophrastus).

Νίτρον = נֶתֶר, carbonate of soda, used as soap, Jer. ii. 22. Herodotus and Attic writers use *λίτρον* in the same sense: *νίτρον* is used exclusively in the papyri and inscriptions from iii/B.C. onwards (Mayser 188 f.), and, if the Semitic origin is the true one, must have been the original form.

[*Παλλακή* = פִּלֶגֶשׁ LXX *passim*. The word occurs in classical Greek from Homer (in the form *παλλακίς*) onwards, and its Semitic origin is very doubtful.]

Σάββατον = שַׁבָּת (שַׁבָּתוֹן) the Sabbath, first found in LXX. In the Pentateuch (except Ex. xxxi. 15 A) and in some of the other books the plural *τὰ σάββατα* is used both for "the sabbath" and "the sabbaths": the sing. *τὸ σάββατον* appears in 4 K. 1—2 Ch. 2 Es. Is. lxvi. 23 Lam. 1—2 M. (and in Ψ^{tit} with the meaning "week"). Dat. plur. usually *σαββάτοις*, in 1 M. ii. 38 *σάββασιν*. Derivatives: *σαββατίζειν, προσάββατον*.

[1] *Μανιάκης* Dan. Θ 1 Es. is another word probably of Persian origin: it is taken over from the Greek in the Aramaic המניכא in Daniel, where other loan-words from the Greek occur (BDB Lexicon s.v.).

[Σάκκος = שַׂק LXX *passim*. Used in classical Greek, and probably derived from Phoenicia.]

Σαμβύκη (Dan. 0Θ) = Aram. שַׂבְּכָא (סַבְּכָא) a stringed instrument, translated in the English Bible by "sackbut" (incorrectly, as the latter was a wind-instrument). Found already in Aristotle and in Polybius (=a siege-engine). Strabo (471) refers to the "barbarous" origin of this and other words for musical instruments: Driver (Dan.) accepts the Aramaic derivation, others consider the word to be "of Syrian or late Egyptian origin" (*Enc. Bibl.* s.v. Music 10).

Σάπφειρος = סַפִּיר, lapis lazuli. (Already used by Theophrastus and the adj. by Aristotle.)

Σίκλος (never *σίγλος* in LXX MSS) = שֶׁקֶל *passim*, usually of the weight, less often of the coin (the coin in the Hexateuch is generally rendered by *δίδραχμον* [? *δραχμή* Jos. vii. 21 B], as also in 2 Es.). Σίγλος is the form attested in Xen. and the Inscriptions (Herwerden Lex. s.v.).

[Σινδών renders סָדִין in Jd. xiv. 12, 13 A, Prov. xxix. 42, but the Semitic origin of the Greek word, which is classical, is doubtful.]

Σιρώνων (gen. pl.) read by certain MSS (see Field: *σιώνων* A) in Jd. viii. 26 appears to be a Hellenized form of שַׁהֲרֹנִים ("crescents," *μηνίσκων* B).

Συκάμινος (*συκάμινον* Am.) = שִׁקְמָה (Aristotle and Theophr.).

Χανών = כָּוָּן "a sacrificial cake," in Jer. vii. 18, li. 19 (in the latter passage א* reads *χαυβῶνας*, Q *χανᾶνας*).

[Χιτών, which constantly renders כֻּתֹּנֶת, is probably of Oriental origin, though the Hebrew is of course not its parent. In 2 Es. ii. 69 *κοθωνοί* B may be a corruption of *κιθῶνες* = (in the papyri) *χιτῶνες*.]

The influence of the Hebrew on the vocabulary of the LXX shows itself not only in transliterations and Hellenized Hebrew words but also in a tendency observable in books other than the Hexateuch to use *Greek words of similar sound to the Hebrew*. The translators in some few cases may have been influenced by a popular but doubtful etymology, e.g. in rendering מוּם by *μῶμος*: more often, doubt as to the exact meaning of the Hebrew has made them resort to this expedient. Some of the instances may be due to later scribes

extracting a meaning out of what were originally transliterations, as when teraphim becomes *θεραπείαν* (1 K. xv. 23 B), but the most flagrant instances of this confession of ignorance, namely those in Jer. *β*, appear to go back to the original translator. (See on this tendency e.g. Driver on 1 Sam. x. 2, Deissmann *BS* 99, Mozley *Psalter of the Church* xx.) The following examples may be quoted: the list is doubtless capable of extension.

Χελιδὼν, ἀγροῦ = עָנִיר Jer. viii. 7 'no doubt a corruption of a translit. *ἀγούρ, στρούθια* being a doublet'. *Ἀερίνην* = וָחֹר "and white" Est. viii. 15 $^{\text{c.a.}}$, *Αἴδε, οἴδε* = הֵידָד "a shout" Jer. xxxi. (xlviii.) 33, xxxii. 16 (xxv. 30). *Ἀλαλάζειν, ἀλαλαγμός, ὀλολύζειν, ὀλολυγμός* = יָלַל hiph., יְלָלָה *passim* in the Prophets: both the Heb. and the Greek words are onomatopœic. *Ἕως, ἅμα τῷ ἡλίῳ* = (הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ) חֹם (עֵד) 2 Es. xvii. 3. *Ἁρμονία* = חָמוֹן Ez. xxiii. 42 (the Heb. may mean "sound" as well as "multitude"). *Ἀρχιεταῖρος Δαυίδ* applied in 2 K. xv. 32 etc. to Hushai the Archite the friend of David (הארכי רעה דוד) is a curious instance: it might be a natural corruption of an earlier *Ἀραχεὶ ἑταῖρος* (cf. xvii. 5), but the rendering *ὁ πρῶτος φίλος* in 1 Ch. xxvii. 33 is clearly an adaptation of *ἀρχιεταῖρος* and is a witness to the early currency of this reading. *Ἄφεσις* = אֲפִיק a channel or stream in 2 K. xxii. 16, Jl i. 20. iii. 18 must be partly due to the same cause, similarity of sound, but see Deissmann *BS* 98 ff. on this use and on *ὕδωρ ἀφέσεως* = מֵי אַפְקִים Ez. xlvii. 3. *Βάρβαρος* = בָּעַר "brutish" Ez. xxi. 31 (36). *Βδέλυγμα* 4 K. xii. 8 B is probably a scribe's improvement upon the translit. *βέεκ*, which A has in this verse and both MSS in the preceding *vv.*, *Βόθρος* = בּוֹר in both parts of Ez. (xxvi. 20, xxxi. 14 etc., but Ez. 3 also employs the usual LXX rendering *λάκκος* [1]. *Καί γε* = גַּם (וְגַם) in some books of the LXX and in the later versions. (?) *Ἐσχαρίτης* "bread baked on the hearth" renders אֻגַּת (exact meaning doubtful) 2 K. vi. 19: the translators perhaps connected it with אֵשׁ "fire." *Ἕως ἄδου* = הוֹי אֲדֹנָי "Ah! lord"(!) Jer. xli. (xxxiv.) 5: the words are correctly rendered in the first part of the book (xxii. 18 *οἴμοι κύριε*). (The two exx. following are given by Driver.) *Θάλασσα* = תְּעָלָה 'a channel' 3 K. xviii. 32, 35, 38. *Ἱερεῖς* = עֶרֶשׂ (a couch) Am. iii. 12: Jerome (ap. Field) suggested

[1] *Ἔλαφος* was the natural rendering of אַיָל, which is carefully distinguished by the translators from אַיִל = *κριός*.

that *ἱερεῖς* is a correction of an original transliteration. Similarity of sound partly accounts for *ἵλεως*[1]=חָלִיל (elsewhere rendered *μηδαμῶς, μὴ γένοιτο, μὴ εἴη*) in 2 K. xx. 20, xxiii. 17=1 Ch. xi. 19 (1 K. xiv. 45 A). *Κειράδας* ("shorn")=קִיר־חֶרֶשׁ Kir-heres Jer. xxxi. (xlviii.) 31, 36 may have arisen out of a transliteration. For *χειμάρρους τῶν κέδρων*=נַחַל קִדְרוֹן in 2 K. xv. 23 B, 3 K. xv. 13 see Lightfoot *Biblical Essays* 172 ff., on the readings in John xviii. 1. *Κωλύειν* (*ἀποκωλ.*) in several books renders כָּלָא. *Λαγχάνειν*=לָכַד "take" 1 K. xiv. 47. *Λάμπας* is the constant rendering of לַפִּיד. *Μεγάλως*=מֵעָלַי "from off me" Job xxx. 30 (not Θ). *Μῶμος* is the habitual and natural rendering of מאום, מוּם. *Ὀρμή*=חֵמָה "fury" Ez. iii. 14, Dan. Θ viii. 6: *ὅρμος*=חוֹמָה "wall" Ez. xxvii. 11 (cf. *ἁρμονία* Ez. supra). *Οὐαί*=הוֹי אוֹי etc. (the Greek interjection appears first in the Alexandrian period). *Παγίς* (from *πήγνυμι*) frequently renders פַּח "a snare" (√=to spread), and the resemblance is made closer by the spelling *πακίς*. *Ἡ ῥάχις* in 1 K. v. 4 *πλὴν ἡ ῥ.* *Δαγὼν ὑπελείφθη* (רַק דָּגוֹן נִשְׁאַר) is a doublet, *πλήν* being doubtless the older rendering. *Ῥοών* "a pomegranate orchard" represents (Hadad)rimmon in Zech. xii. 11. *Συκοφαντεῖν* (*-της -τία*) renders √עשק "oppress," "defraud" in Ψ Prov. Job Θ Eccl., √שקר "lie," "deceive" in Lev. xix. 11. *Τιμωρίαν*=תַּמְרוּרִים "guide-posts" Jer. xxxviii. (xxxi.) 21 (possibly from a transliteration *τιμωρ(ε)ίν*): *Σειών* ib. is another instance. *Τόκος* renders תֹּךְ "oppression" in Ψ liv. 12 RT$^{c.a}$א (*κόπος* B*א) lxxi. 14, Jer. ix. 6. *Τοπάζιον* is suggested by פָּז "refined gold" in Ψ cxviii. 127 (contrast *λίθος τίμιος* Ψ xviii. 11, xx. 4, Prov. viii. 19). *Τύμπανον* constantly renders תֹּף (the word should perhaps be included in the previous list as a loan-word). *Φακός* renders פַּךְ "a flask" (also צַפַּחַת "a cruse") in 1 and 4 K., but this meaning of the Greek word is classical. *Φρουραί* for Purim in Est. ix. 6 etc. is an illustration of the way in which a Hebrew word was twisted to yield an intelligible meaning to Greeks: the form, if not original, is at least as old as Josephus (*Ant.* xi. 6. 13 *ἡμέρας...φρουραίας*). *Χελώνη* Hos. xii. 11 appears to be suggested by the sound of גַּל "a heap," as *χάος* is suggested by גַּי גַּיְא in Mic. i. 6, Zech. xiv. 4.

[1] "Ιλεώς σοι etc. were current phrases in the vernacular, J. H. Moulton, *Prol.* 240.

Semitic influence shown (1) in new meanings and uses of words, (2) in syntax.

Apart from transliterations and Hellenized words, the influence of the Hebrew shows itself in a considerable number of new uses of Greek words and in the coining of new phrases which correspond literally to the Hebrew. A list of new-coined words[1] and of words with a new connotation is given in Dr Swete's *Introduction* p. 307. Here it will merely be necessary to add a few remarks on some new uses to which a few common Greek words are put.

Διδόναι begins to supplant τιθέναι (which still retains its hold in some books), owing to the use of the Heb. נתן in both senses. The use is characteristic of the later historical books though not confined to them: Dt. xxviii. 1 *δώσω σε ὑπεράνω*, 2 K. xx. 3 *ἔδωκεν αὐτὰς ἐν οἴκῳ φυλακῆς*, cf. 3 K. vi. 18, 4 K. xvi. 17, Is. lx. 17 *δώσω τοὺς ἄρχοντάς σου ἐν εἰρήνῃ*, Jer. vi. 27 *δοκιμαστὴν δέδωκά σε*, Ob. i. 2 etc. (The use of the verb with inf. in the sense of "allow," Gen. xxxi. 7, N. xxi. 23, Jd. xv. 1 B A *ἀφῆκεν* is classical.)

The use of *ἀριθμῷ* for "few" in N. ix. 20 *ἡμέρας ἀριθμῷ* (ימים מספר), Ez. xii. 16 *ἄνδρας ἀριθμῷ* (אנשי מ) is removed from the category of "Hebraisms" by a passage like Hdt. vi. 58 *ἐπεὰν γὰρ ἀποθάνῃ βασιλεὺς...δεῖ...ἀριθμῷ τῶν περιοίκων ἀναγκαστοὺς ἐς τὸ κῆδος ἰέναι* "a certain number." The translators usually prefer to write *ὀλίγοι* (*βραχεῖς, ὀλιγοστός*) *ἀριθμῷ*: in Dt. xxxiii. 6 they have either misunderstood or intentionally perverted the meaning, *ἔστω πολὺς ἐν ἀριθμῷ*.

The Heb. ימים, when used of a year or other period of time, is literally rendered by *ἡμέραι* in phrases like *ἀφ' (ἐξ) ἡμερῶν εἰς ἡμέρας* Ex. xiii. 10, Jd. xi. 40, xxi. 19, 1 K. i. 3 etc., *δύο ἔτη (ἐναυτὸς) ἡμερῶν* Gen. xli. 1, 2 K. xiv. 28 (cf. xiii. 23 *διετηρίδα ἡμερῶν*), Jer. xxxv. 3, Lev. xxv. 29, *μῆνα ἡμερῶν* Gen. xxix. 14, N. xi. 20 f., Jdth iii. 10 (more classical Dt. xxi. 13

[1] Προσωπολημπτεῖν should be deleted (p. 44), and for *ἀναθεματίζειν* see p. 27 above.

κλαύσεται...μηνὸς ἡμέρας), ἑβδομὰς ἡμερῶν Dan. Θ x. 2 f. (Dan. O omits "days" in 2 and inserts τῶν in 3), θυσία τῶν ἡμερῶν (Heb. = "yearly sacrifice") 1 K. i. 21, xx. 6. The Heb. phrases "year of days" etc. mean either "a year of time" (BDB.) or "a full year" (R.V.) etc.: in the latter sense class. Greek writes τέλεος ἐνιαυτός, τελέους ἑπτὰ μῆνας etc.

> The use of ימים="a year" has been misunderstood and the word omitted in N. ix. 22 μηνὸς ἡμέρας (=M. T. "either two days or a month or a year," lit. "or days"), cf. the omission of ימים ו 1 K. xxvii. 7: it is also misunderstood in 2 Ch. xxi. 19 (Heb. "at the end of two years") where the Gk apparently means "when the time of the days amounted to two days."

Other examples of literalism in time-statements are ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ἑσπερινῶν Lev. xxiii. 5 (elsewhere in Pent. expressed by (τὸ) πρὸς ἑσπέραν, τὸ δειλινόν, ὀψέ), ὡς ἅπαξ καὶ ἅπαξ (= כפעם בפעם = as time after time) Jd. xvi. 20 B, xx. 30 f., 1 K. iii. 10, xx. 25 (idiomatically rendered N. xxiv. 1 κατὰ τὸ εἰωθός, Jd. xvi. 20 A καθὼς ἀεί).

Εἰρήνη takes over the meaning of the Heb. שלום in some formulas of salutation, being used of the health or welfare of a single individual, as well as of friendly relations between nations. The Heb. phrase for "to greet" is שאל לי לשלום "to ask someone about peace (welfare)." Hence in the later historical books we find phrases like Jd. xviii. 15 B εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὸν οἶκον...καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν εἰς εἰρήνην (= A ἠσπάσαντο αὐτόν), cf. 1 K. xvii. 22 A, xxv. 5: we even find ἐπερωτᾶν...εἰς εἰρήνην τοῦ πολέμου 2 K. xi. 7 for "to ask how the war progressed": occasionally the neut. of the definite article is inserted, ἐρωτᾶν τὰ εἰς εἰρήνην 1 K. x. 4, xxx. 21 B, 2 K. viii. 10 = 1 Ch. xviii. 10[1]. The same group of books uses εἰρήνη (σοι) "peace be to thee," Ἡ εἰρήνη σοι; ἡ εἰρήνη τῷ ἀνδρί σου; κ.τ.λ. 4 K. iv. 26 "is it well with thee?" (class. χαῖρε, ὑγιαίνεις;): in 3 K. ii. 13

[1] In the N.T. Luke in xiv. 32, borrowing the LXX phrase, uses it of a king negotiating for peace, thus keeping the classical meaning of εἰρήνη.

the noun takes the place of the adj., *εἰρήνη ἡ εἴσοδός σου*; Contrast with the later historical books the more classical phrases used in Genesis xliii. 27 *ἠρώτησεν δὲ αὐτοὺς Πῶς ἔχετε*; xxix. 6, xxxvii. 14, xliii. 27 f. *ὑγιαίνει*; etc., and the use of *ἀσπάζεσθαι* in Ex. xviii. 7, Jd. xviii. 15 A. The later books (including Tobit א) further have *πορεύεσθαι* (*βαδίζειν, δεῦρο*) *εἰς εἰρήνην* (*ἐν εἰρήνῃ*): the Pent. also uses *εἰρήνη* in a similar way but with another preposition, *μετ' εἰρήνης ἀπέρχεσθαι* (*ἥκειν*) Gen. xv. 15: elsewhere *βαδίζειν ὑγιαίνων* Ex. iv. 18, 2 K. xiv. 8.

Ῥῆμα = דבר = *res* appears to be a Hebraism, but may have been so used in colloquial Greek: a similar use of λόγος has classical authority. Exx.: Gen. xv. 1 *μετὰ δὲ τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα*, xxii. 1 etc., Gen. xxxviii. 10 *πονηρὸν δὲ ἐφάνη τὸ ῥῆμα...ὅτι ἐποίησεν τοῦτο*, Dt. ii. 7 *οὐκ ἐπεδεήθης ῥήματος* (= *οὐδενός*) etc. In the N. T. it is noticeable that the use is, apart from O. T. quotations, confined to the more Hebraic portions of Luke's writings. Exodus twice uses the adj. *ῥητός* in a similar way: ix. 4 *οὐ τελευτήσει ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ υἱῶν ῥητόν* (= *οὐδείς*), xxii. 9 *κατὰ πᾶν ῥητὸν ἀδίκημα* "in any wrong doing whatsoever." The literal translation of על דברת "in the matter of," "to the end that" by *περὶ λαλιᾶς, περὶ λόγου* is a peculiarity of Aquila, Eccl. iii. 18, vii. 15, viii. 2: contrast Ex. viii. 12 (8) *περί* = על דבר and the omission of דבר ib. xvi. 4 *τὸ τῆς ἡμέρας εἰς ἡμέραν*.

Υἱός is used to render some idiomatic phrases with בן, but this Hebraism is mainly confined to the literal group: the Hexateuch, Isaiah and Chronicles generally avoid it.

(*a*) Of age. Heb. says "a son of so many years" for "so many years old." Hence Gen. xi. 10 *Σὴμ υἱὸς ἐτῶν ἑκατόν* (the only example in the Hexateuch), cf. Jd. ii. 8 B, 1 K. iv. 15, 2 K. iv. 4, v. 4, xix. 32, 35, 3 K. xii. 24 a, 24 h, xxii. 42, 4 K. *passim*, 2 Ch. xxvi. 3 BA, ib. (in A text only) xxviii. 1, xxxvi. 2, 9 (31 examples in all, of which 19 occur in K. *βδ*).

On the other hand the simple gen. of age or some other paraphrase is frequent in the Hexateuch (Gen. vii. 6, xii. 4 etc.: Ex. xxx. 14 *ἀπὸ εἰκοσαετοῦς* etc.: Ex. xii. 5 etc. *ἐνιαύσιος*), and Chronicles (1 Ch. ii. 21, 2 Ch. xxi. 5, 20, xxii. 2 etc.) and occurs occasionally elsewhere, 2 K. ii. 10, 2 Es. iii. 8, Is. lxv. 20, Jer. lii. 1, Dan. Θ v. 31. *Παιδίον ὀκτὼ ἡμερῶν* Gen. xvii. 12 is classical.

(*b*) Of characteristics, qualities etc. The same distinction in the books holds good. Jd.—4 K., 2 Es., Ψ, Ez. write e.g. *υἱὸς ἀλλότριος*, *υἱὸς ἀλλογενής* (an alien בן נכר), *υἱὸς δυνάμεως*, *υἱὸς ἀδικίας* e.g. 2 K. vii. 10 (= 1 Ch. xvii. 9 || *ἀδικία* simply), *υἱοὶ τῶν συμμίξεων* "hostages," 4 K. xiv. 14 = 2 Ch. xxv. 24, *υἱοὶ θανατώσεως* or *θανάτου* 1 K. xxvi. 16, 2 K. xii. 5 (cf. Ψ lxxviii. 11, ci. 21, *υἱοὶ τῶν τεθανατωμένων*); on the other hand books like the Hexateuch and Isaiah omit *υἱός* or employ paraphrase, writing *ἀλλογενής*, *ἀλλόφυλος* Gen. xvii. 27, Ex. xii. 43 etc., Is. lx. 10, lxi. 5 (but *υἱὸς ἀλλ.* Gen. xvii. 12, Is. lxii. 8), *ἐκ βοῶν* etc. = בן בקר Ex. xxix. 1 etc. (contrast 1 K. xiv. 32 *τέκνα βοῶν*): further paraphrases occur in e.g. Dt. xxv. 2 *ἄξιος ᾖ πληγῶν*, Is. v. 1 *ἐν τόπῳ πίονι*, xiv. 12 *ὁ πρωὶ ἀνατέλλων*, xxi. 10 *οἱ ὀδυνώμενοι*.

Hebrew is fond of what may be called *physiognomical expressions*, that is to say phrases referring to parts of the human body, ear, eye, face, hand, mouth etc.: in particular, many prepositions are seldom found without some such adjunct. This accounts for a wide use of *ὀφθαλμός*, *πρόσωπον*, *στόμα*, *χείρ* etc., in the LXX: many of the LXX phrases are, however, passable, if unidiomatic, Greek expressions: the Hebrew has merely given them a wider circulation. A perfectly literal translation is avoided where the vernacular had some similar, but not identical, phrase. Thus *ἐνώπιον*, which is unknown to the classical language, but is found in papyri from ii/—i/ B.C. onwards[1], is a favourite rendering of לפני and בעיני.

[1] Deissmann *BS* 213: Dr J. H. Moulton adds Teb. 14 (114 B.C.) and other examples of adjectival *ἐνώπιος*. The word is retained in modern Greek,

The following are some of the more striking instances of direct imitation of the Hebrew.

Ἀποκαλύπτειν (ἀνοίγειν) τὸ οὖς (ὠτίον) τινος = "to reveal to someone" R. iv. 4, 1 K. ix. 15, xx. 2 etc., 2 K. vii. 27, 1 Ch. xvii. 25.

As regards the use of ὀφθαλμός in phrases like "to seem good" or "to find favour in the eyes (i.e. in the estimation) of someone" (בעיני) we find the same sort of distinction between the groups of books as elsewhere. The classical παρά τινι or other paraphrase is rarely found. As a rule the Pentateuch with some of the other books render בעיני by ἐναντίον (or the vernacular ἐνώπιον, ἔναντι), while the literal rendering ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς is reserved for the later historical books[1].

Exx.: "To find (give) favour in someone's eyes" is rendered by (1) χάριν ἔχειν (εὑρίσκειν) παρά τινι in Ex. xxxiii. 12, 16, N. xi. 15 (cf. Est. ii. 15), (2) εὑρ. (διδόναι) χάριν ἐναντίον (ἐνώπ.) τινος some 24 times in the Pent., Gen. xxx. 27 etc., also in 3 K. xi. 19, Est. v. 8, vii. 3, (3) εὑρ. χάριν (ἔλεος) ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς τινος in (Gen. xxxiii. 8 A: all other MSS ἐναντίον or ἐνώπ.) Jd. vi. 17, R. ii. 2, 10, 13, 1 K. i. 18, xvi. 22 etc., 2 K. xiv. 22, xv. 25, xvi. 4. The phrases "to seem good (evil etc.) in someone's eyes" are (1) paraphrased in Gen. xvi. 6 ἀρεστὸν ᾗ, Jos. ix. 31 ἀρέσκει, (2) rendered by ἀρέσκειν (ἀρεστόν, σκληρόν etc.) ἐναντίον (ἐνώπιον, ἔναντι) in the Pent., Gen. xvi. 4 f., xix. 14 etc., N. xxxvi. 6, Dt. xii. 8, 25, iv. 25, also in Jd. ii. 11, iii. 7, 2 K. x. 3, 1 Ch. xix. 3, (3) by ἀγαθὸν (εὐθὲς, πονηρὸν, εὐθύνεσθαι etc.) ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς τινος *passim* in Jd., 1 K., 2 K. (from x. 12), 4 K. and in some of the later books. The adhesion of Wisdom (iii. 2, ix. 9) to the last group is noticeable.

Πρόσωπον (which is found in Polybius with the meaning "person") is kept in the rendering of נשא פנים "to accept the person" (to favour or be partial to anyone), but the verb is usually altered. Θαυμάζειν τὸ πρόσωπον is the rendering which met with general acceptance (Gen. xix. 21, Dt. x. 17, xxviii. 50,

Kennedy *Sources of N.T. Greek* 155. In N.T. its absence from Mt. and Mc. is striking: Lc. and Ap. make a large use of it.

[1] And is unexampled in the N.T.

4 K. v. 1, Prov. xviii. 5, Job xiii. 10 etc., Is. ix. 15). Another verb has been occasionally substituted, προσδέχεσθαι Gen. xxxii. 20, αἱρετίζειν 1 K. xxv. 35, ἐπαισχύνεσθαι Job xxxiv. 19. The literal version λαμβάνειν (τὸ) πρόσωπον occurs only in Lev. xix. 15 (necessitated by the use of θαυμάζειν in the same *v.*), Ψ lxxxi. 2, Job xlii. 8, Lam. iv. 16, Mal. i. 8 f., ii. 9. Later formations, unknown to the Alexandrian translators[1], and first appearing in the N.T., are προσωπολημπτεῖν, -λήμπτης, -ληψία. It is interesting to note the three stages through which the Hebrew idiom finds its way into Greek: first the possible but unidiomatic version, then the baldly literal, then the new Greek words coined from the literal version. Ἀπὸ προσώπου, πρὸ προσώπου etc. (where the classical language would use the prep. alone) abound.

Hebraistic uses of **στόμα** may be illustrated by such phrases as ἐπερωτᾶν τὸ στόμα τινός Gen. xxiv. 57, ἐπὶ τῷ στόματί σου ὑπακούσεται πᾶς ὁ λαός Gen. xli. 40, ἐπὶ στόματος δύο μαρτύρων... στήσεται πᾶν ῥῆμα Dt. xix. 15. But the prepositional phrases לפי, על פי, בפי "according to" are, in the Pentateuch at least, usually rendered by a simple prep., κατά c. acc. (Gen. xliii. 7, xlv. 21, N. vi. 21, Dt. xvii. 11), πρός c. acc. (L. xxv. 51 πρὸς ταῦτα) or ἐπί c. dat. (Dt. xvii. 6). The avoidance of anthropomorphism sometimes causes omission or paraphrase of "mouth" where God is spoken of: Jos. ix. 20 ἐπηρώτησαν, N. iii. 16 etc. διὰ φωνῆς Κυρίου.

The uses of **χείρ** in prepositional phrases (on the model of ביד and kindred phrases) are innumerable: many of these, however, may be illustrated from the Hellenistic language. Ἐμπιμπλάναι (τελειοῦν, πληροῦν) τὰς χεῖρας Ex. xxviii. 37 etc., is the literal rendering of the Hebrew for "to consecrate." An example of literal reproduction of the Hebrew is 4 K. ix. 24 ἔπλησεν τὴν χεῖρα ἐν τῷ τόξῳ: in ἀποστέλλειν τὴν χεῖρα Ex. ix. 15

[1] Προσωποληπτεῖν should be deleted from the list in Dr Swete's *Introduction* 307.

and similar phrases the Hebraism lies in the new meaning attached to the verb. (The meaning "handiwork" (Jer. x. 9) is known to secular Greek: possibly the translators attached the same meaning to Χεὶρ Ἀβεσσαλώμ, the name given to the "monument" (יד) of Absalom, 2 K. xviii. 18.)

Under the head of *pronouns* we notice an increased use of ἀνήρ (ἄνθρωπος), due to the influence of the Hebrew איש, where classical writers would have written ἕκαστος, τις or πᾶς τις, and of phrases like ἄνθρωπος πρὸς τὸν πλησίον (ἀδελφὸν) αὐτοῦ for ἕτερος πρὸς τὸν ἕτερον. Though the imitation of the Hebrew is unmistakable, it is difficult to draw the line between what may be called "Hebraisms" and what is good vernacular or κοινή Greek. The use of ἀνήρ for τις can be illustrated from Aristophanes. The rarity of phrases like ἕτερος τὸν ἕτερον (still found in the Pentateuch, Isaiah and the early chapters of Ezekiel) is partly due to the tendency in the κοινή to abandon words expressive of duality. But it is noticeable that the use of ἀνήρ = ἕκαστος in phrases like δότε μοι ἀνὴρ ἐνώτιον Jd. viii. 24, λάβωμεν ἀνὴρ εἰς δοκὸν μίαν 4 K. vi. 2, is practically confined to one group of books viz. Jd., R., K. βγ (2 K. xiii. 29 B, xx. 1, 3 K. i. 49), K. γδ (3 K. xxii. 10, 4 K. iii. 23 etc.), 2 Es. (cf. Cant. iii. 8, Ez. xviii. 8, xxxiii. 26 A, 1 M. ii. 40): in these books ἕκαστος, which is freely used in other parts of the LXX, is either wholly or nearly unrepresented[1]. Here, then, in view of the avoidance of the literal rendering in the majority of the books, we appear to be justified in speaking of a Hebraism. With a negative ἀνήρ replaces μηδείς or οὐδείς: 4 K. x. 19 ἀνὴρ μὴ ἐπισκεπήτω, x. 25, xxiii. 18. Ἀνήρ is occasionally used of inanimate things:

[1] The distinction between the portions of the Kingdom books should be noted. Ἕκαστος = איש is freely used in K. α (19 times), K. ββ (5), K. γγ (13). On the other hand it is absent from K. βγ (excepting 2 K. xiii. 29 A) and occurs twice only in the B text of K. γδ (3 times in A text).

Job (probably Θ) xli. 8 (of the scales of leviathan). The duplication ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπος, ἀνδρὶ ἀνδρί = "anyone" (Lev. xv. 2, xvii. 3 etc., Ez. xiv. 4, 7) is analogous to vernacular phrases (Moulton *Prol.* 97).

The pleonastic demonstrative pronoun appended to a relative pronoun or a relative adverb, e.g. ᾧ...αὐτῷ (=אשר לו), οὗ...ἐκεῖ (=אשר שם), is found in all parts of the LXX and undoubtedly owes its *frequency* to the Hebrew original. But the fact that it is found in an original Greek work such as 2 Macc. (xii. 27 ἐν ᾗ...ἐν αὐτῇ) and a paraphrase such as 1 Esdras (iii. 5, 9, iv. 54, 63, vi. 32) is sufficient to warrant its presence in the κοινή[1]. In modern Greek the relative is expressed by the adverb πού followed by the demonstrative in its proper case—a use which is strangely analogous to the Hebrew. In the LXX the laws of concord are observed: the relative and demonstrative agree in gender, number and case, and if the demonstrative is preceded by a preposition the relative as a rule takes one as well (e.g. Gen. xxiv. 3 μεθ' ὧν...μετ' αὐτῶν: similarly ὅθεν ἐκεῖθεν Gen. x. 14 etc., not οὗ ἐκ.). The fact that this phenomenon, which, as Dr J. H. Moulton remarks, is made familiar to Englishmen by the language of Mrs Gamp, should have grown up independently in the two languages is not surprising.

Under the head of *prepositions*, Hebrew is responsible for the *extensive* use of a large number of prepositional phrases in place of an accusative after a transitive verb. The fact, however, that a phrase like φυλάσσεσθαι ἀπό τινος is found already in Xenophon makes us cautious in regarding all these as Hebraisms. Several of them probably never found a place in the Greek language: the use of the preposition, which was allowable with one verb, was extended to others, where the Hebrew had an analogous use. Besides the instance mentioned ἀπό (corresponding to מן) is used after αἰσχύνεσθαι, εὐλαβεῖσθαι, λανθάνειν, προσέχειν, τρέμειν, ὑπερηφανεύεσθαι, ὑπερ-

[1] No instance of it seems, however, to have been found in the papyri: the example quoted by Kühner and Blass from Hdt. iv. 44 is rather different: Blass quotes ὧν...τούτων from Hypereides. It would appear that it was not a very common use: in the N. T. it is quite uncommon, the Apocalypse alone using it with any frequency (7 times).

ὁρᾶν, φοβεῖσθαι. Similarly, ἐν (ב) is used instead of an accusative after αἱρετίζειν, εὐδοκεῖν, θέλειν, συνιέναι etc. In the same way, we find φείδεσθαι ἐπί (על) τινα, ἐξελέσθαι ἐπί τινα (Job Θ xxxvi. 21), συνιέναι ἐπί τινα (Job Θ xxxi. 1). The Theodotion portions of Job supply numerous examples of direct imitation of the Hebrew: ζητεῖν ὀπίσω τινός xxxix. 8, μέχρι (ἕως) ὑμῶν συνήσω (עד) xxxii. 12, φῶς ἐγγὺς ἀπὸ προσώπου σκότους xvii. 12.

The frequent LXX use of ἐν of accompanying circumstances or instrument, as in St Paul's ἐν ῥάβδῳ ἔλθω...; (1 Cor. iv. 21) has been removed from the category of Hebraisms by the appearance of ἐν μαχαίρῃ, ἐν ὅπλοις 'armed with a sword' etc. in a little group of papyri of the end of ii/B.C. (Teb. 41. 4, *c.* 119 B.C., etc.).

A test-case for the length to which the translators were ready to carry their imitation of the Hebrew is afforded by their treatment of "the *infinitive absolute*" in phrases like מוֹת תָּמוּת "thou shalt surely die." (*a*) A solitary instance occurs of an attempt to render the Hebrew construction quite literally, Jos. xvii. 13 B ἐξωλεθρεῦσαι δὲ αὐτοὺς οὐκ ἐξωλέθρευσαν (A ὀλεθρεύσει). (*b*) In a certain number of cases (mainly in the Pentateuch) the Hebrew inf. is simply omitted. (*c*) The practice of our English translators[1] of employing an adverb, particle or other form of paraphrase is occasionally resorted to: Gen. xxxii. 12 καλῶς εὖ σε ποιήσω (not a doublet), Ex. xv. 1 ἐνδόξως δεδόξασται, N. xxii. 17 ἐντίμως τιμήσω σε, 4 K. v. 11 πάντως ἐξελεύσεται, Prov. (in all three cases where the Hebrew construction appears[2]) xxiii. 1 νοητῶς νόει, xxiii. 24, xxvii. 23: Is. lvi. 3 ἀφοριεῖ με ἄρα: Job xiii. 10 οὐθὲν ἧττον, Gen. xlvi. 4 = Am. ix. 8 εἰς τέλος.

[1] E.g. Is. xxiv. 19, "The earth is *utterly* broken down, the earth is *clean* dissolved, the earth is moved *exceedingly*." The A.V. shows great versatility in its renderings. Elsewhere we have "*freely* eat," "*must needs* be circumcised," "*indeed* I was stolen away," "*in any wise* return."

[2] In Prov. xxiv. 22 a (not in M.T.) δεχόμενος ἐδέξατο.

But as a general rule the rendering takes one of two forms: (*d*) finite verb with dat. of the cognate noun, e.g. *βρώσει φάγῃ* Gen. ii. 16, (*e*) finite verb with participle of the same verb or a verb of kindred meaning, e.g. Gen. iii. 16 *πληθύνων πληθυνῶ*. The total number of occurrences of these two constructions is about the same, approximately 200 of each: but there is a marked diversity between the groups of books in the preference shown for one mode of translation or the other. The Pentateuch prefers the construction of noun and verb, which is used more than twice as often as part. and verb. The former construction is always used in the Pentateuch where the verb is in the passive, e.g. Gen. xvii. 13 *περιτομῇ περιτμηθήσεται*, xl. 15 *κλοπῇ ἐκλάπην*, Dt. xxi. 14 *πράσει οὐ πραθήσεται*. Where the verb is active or middle either construction may be used: cf. Gen. ii. 16 *βρώσει φάγῃ* with Lev. vii. 8 *φαγὼν φάγῃ*, Dt. xxiv. 13 *ἀποδόσει ἀποδώσεις* with xv. 10 *διδοὺς δώσεις*: but, generally speaking, the Pentateuch translators prefer (*d*) wherever there is a convenient noun available. Where the participial construction is used in the Pentateuch, it is often rendered more idiomatic by varying the verb (e.g. Gen. xviii. 10 *ἐπαναστρέφων ἥξω*, Ex. xxiii. 4 *ἀποστρέψας ἀποδώσεις*, Lev. xiii. 7 *μεταβαλοῦσα μεταπέσῃ*, xiv. 48 *παραγενόμενος εἰσέλθῃ*) or by using the simple and compound verb (as Herodotus uses *φεύγων ἐκφεύγειν* v. 95, e.g. Gen. xliii. 7 *ἐρωτῶν ἐπηρώτ.*, Lev. x. 16 *ζητῶν ἐξεζήτησεν*, N. xii. 14, xxx. 15). Instances of the bald use of the pres. part. and finite form of the same verb are not frequent till we come to Deuteronomy, which has nine of them.

In the later historical books, on the other hand, the participial construction is used almost exclusively. The four Kingdom books, apart from a single phrase[1] *θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖται* (*θανατώσητε* etc.: 1 K. xiv. 39, 44, xxii. 16, 2 K. xii. 14, xiv. 14, 3 K. ii. 37, 42, iii. 26 f., 4 K. i. 4, 6, 16, viii. 10, xi. 15) and its

[1] Its occurrence in the familiar story of the Fall (Gen. ii. 17, iii. 4) probably accounts for its retention.

opposite ζωῇ ζήσῃ (4 K. viii. 10, 14), have only three examples of the verb with cognate noun, all in 2 Kingdoms, viz. i. 6 περιπτώματι περιέπεσαν, xviii. 3 φυγῇ φύγωμεν, xix. 42 βρώσει ἐφάγαμεν (βρῶσιν A). On the other hand in 1—4 K. there are 59 examples of the participial construction[1]. We note, further, that this construction is now used even where the main verb is passive, e.g. 1 K. ii. 27 ἀποκαλυφθεὶς ἀπεκαλύφθην, 2 K. vi. 20 ἀποκαλύπτεται ἀποκαλυφθείς, xx. 18 ἠρωτημένος ἠρωτήθην: the participle may stand after the finite verb, as in 2 K. vi. 20: the use of different verbs or of simple and compound verb is abandoned (the nearest approach to this being 1 K. xx. 21 εἶπω λέγων, 3 K. xiii. 32 γινόμενον ἔσται, 4 K. xiv. 10 τύπτων ἐπάταξας). In the remaining books of the LXX the participial construction preponderates, except in Isaiah (eight examples of noun to three of part.), Ezekiel, Micah and the A texts of Joshua (two of noun to one of part.) and of Judges (ten of noun to eight of part.). The tense of the part. is present or aorist: a future is used in Jd. iv. 9 A πορευσομένη πορεύσομαι, Sir. xxviii. 1 διαστηριῶν διαστηρίσει, so Aquila in Ψ xlix. 21.

Neither construction appears to occur in the "Greek" (i.e. untranslated) books. Instances, however, are found of both forms where there is no inf. abs. in the M.T.: most of these are probably due to the translators having a different text from our Hebrew. In the N.T. there are no examples of the participial construction except in O.T. quotations (Blass § 74, 4). The other construction is employed by Luke in both his works (ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμ., ἀπειλῇ ἀπειλ., παραγγελίᾳ παρηγγ., ἀναθέματι ἀνεθεμ.), as also in Jo. iii. 29 χαρᾷ χαίρει, Ja. v. 17 προσευχῇ προσηύξατο (ibid. § 38, 3).

It appears, then, that the Pentateuch translators, in rendering this Hebrew idiom, had resort to one or other of two modes of translation, both of which had some authority in the

[1] For the Pentateuch the statistics are approximately noun and verb 108, part. and verb 49.

classical language, recalling, respectively, the phrases cited by Blass and J. H. Moulton, viz. *γάμῳ γαμεῖν* ("in true wedlock"), *φυγῇ φεύγειν* ("with all speed") and the *φεύγων ἐκφεύγει* of Herodotus. Their successors confined themselves almost entirely to the latter, probably considering the participle a nearer approach to the Hebrew infinitive, but refrained from a perfectly literal rendering which would have defied the laws of Greek syntax. Even the participial construction seemed so strange that it found no imitators in the N.T. writers.

Constructions with ἐγένετο. "When the Hebrew writers have occasion in the course of their narrative to insert a clause specifying the circumstances under which an action takes place, instead of introducing it abruptly, they are in the habit of (so to speak) preparing the way for it by the use of the formula וַיְהִי '*and it was* or *came to pass*'" (Driver *Hebrew Tenses*, ed. 3, p. 89). The sentence is usually, though not always, resumed by a second וְ. This construction is in the majority of cases reproduced in the LXX. Of the three forms found in the N.T. (almost entirely in Luke's writings), viz. (*a*) *ἐγένετο ἦλθε*, (*b*) *ἐγένετο καὶ ἦλθε*, (*c*) *ἐγένετο ἐλθεῖν*, LXX, with a single exception[1], uses the first two only. Luke in his Gospel writes (*a*) twice as often as (*b*) and (*b*) twice as often as (*c*): in Acts he abandons the first two altogether in favour of (*c*). (*c*), as Moulton shows, can be closely paralleled from the papyri which use *γίνεται* c. inf., and at a far earlier time *γίγνεται εὑρεῖν* "it is possible to find" is attested in Theognis 639 (quoted by LS). Xenophon, moreover, uses *ἐγένετο ὥστε* or *ὡς* "it happened that." (*c*) therefore had close analogies in the vernacular and literary speech. (*a*) and (*b*), on the contrary, appear in

[1] 3 K. xi. 43 B *καὶ ἐγενήθη ὡς ἤκουσεν Ἱεροβοὰμ...κατευθύνειν* "he came straight off" (the Heb. [xii. 2] is different). In 3 K. iv. 7 *μῆνα ἐν τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ ἐγίνετο ἐπὶ τὸν ἕνα χορηγεῖν* the inf. is the subject of the verb, cf. 2 Ch. vi. 7. In 2 M. iii. 16 (quoted by J. H. Moulton) *ἦν δὲ...ὁρῶντα...τιτρώσκεσθαι*, 21 V *ἐλεεῖν δὲ ἦν*, the verb seems rather the equivalent of *ἔδει* "it was impossible not to," than of *ἐγένετο*: cf. ib. vi. 9 *παρῆν οὖν ὁρᾷν*.

Luke to be borrowed directly from the LXX, and for these constructions no illustration has yet been quoted from the κοινή. The statistics for the LXX are (if my count is right) as follows: passages where the readings vary (there are not many) have been included in both columns.

	(*a*) ἐγένετο ἦλθε	(*b*) ἐγένετο καὶ ἦλθε
Pentateuch { Gen. 34, Ex. 12, L.N.Dt. 4 }	50	{ Gen. 25, Ex. 5, L.N.Dt. 9 } 39
Jos.	7	9
Jd.—4 Kings	26	164
1 2 Ch.	11	19
1 Es. (A text)	1	—
2 Es.	4	11
Other "Writings"	7	4
{Prophets / Min. Is. Jer. Lam. Ez.}	28	12
Daniel O	2	3
„ Θ	6	3
1 Macc.	3	5
Total	145	269

The following results are to be noted. (1) The construction (*b*) predominates in the Greek as does its equivalent in the Hebrew. (2) But this preponderance is due to the support given to it by the later historical books, which generally follow the Heb. slavishly. (3) The first two books of the Pentateuch, on the other hand, and the prophetical books, prefer (*a*). A closer analysis shows that in Genesis the Heb. has a second ו in 30 out of the 34 cases where the Greek uses (*a*), as well as in all the cases of (*b*). 4 K. on the other hand, which reads (*a*) 12 times, (*b*) 26 times, only twice omits καί without warrant from the M.T. (v. 7, vi. 30). It appears that while both (*a*) and (*b*) were experiments of the translators, which must be classed as "Hebraisms," the apposition of the two verbs[1]

[1] We may perhaps compare in the papyri καλῶς ποιήσεις γράψεις (πέμψεις) OP ii. 297. 3 (54 A.D.), ib. 299. 3 (late i/A.D.) for the more usual γράψας.

without καί was rather more in the spirit of the later language, which preferred to say e.g. "It happened last week I was on a journey," rather than "It was a week ago and I was journeying." At all events the former mode of speech prevails in the earlier LXX books and in Luke's Gospel. (4) The free Greek books (2—4 Macc.) abjure both constructions, and the paraphrases make very little use of them. These two classes of books, on the other hand, retain the classical συνέβη with the inf.[1]

In Jd. xii. 5 A we appear to have a fourth construction καὶ ἐγενήθη ὅτι εἶπαν αὐτοῖς οἱ διασεσωσμένοι..., though ὅτι may be intended for "because" (Heb. כי = "when"): a similar doubt attaches to 2 K. xiv. 26, 4 K. xvii. 7, 2 Ch. v. 11 (Heb. כי = "because").

The less frequent והיה (1) with the meaning "it shall come to pass" is rendered[2] by καὶ ἔσται, usually without a second copula, which is generally absent from the Heb., (2) in frequentative sense "it came to pass repeatedly" by the imperfect, Gen. xxxviii. 9 ἐγίνετο, ὅταν εἰσήρχετο..., ἐξέχεεν.

Next to ἐγένετο probably the most frequent Hebraism in the LXX is the *use of* προστιθέναι (προστίθεσθαι) = יסף *in place of* πάλιν or a similar adverb. Here again the construction takes three forms: (*a*) προσέθετο (προσέθηκεν) λαβεῖν (τοῦ λαβεῖν), (*b*) προσέθετο (προσέθηκεν) καὶ ἔλαβεν, (*c*) προσθεὶς (προσθέμενος) ἔλαβεν. (*c*), the only one of the three for which approximate classical parallels could be quoted, is limited to the following passages: Job xxvii. 1 ἔτι δὲ προσθεὶς...εἶπεν (so xxix. 1, xxxvi. 1), Est. viii. 3 καὶ προσθεῖσα ἐλάλησεν, Gen. xxv. 1 προσθέμενος δὲ Ἀβραὰμ ἔλαβεν γυναῖκα "took another wife" (the passage quoted in LS, Soph. *Trach.* 1224 ταύτην

[1] Also in Gen. xli. 13, xlii. 38.

[2] The Hexateuch sometimes omits the introductory verb: Gen. iv. 14, xlvi. 33, Ex. i. 10, iv. 8, xxxiii. 8 f., Dt. xviii. 19, Jos. vii. 15.

προσθοῦ γυναῖκα, "take to wife," is not really parallel), xxxviii. 5 καὶ προσθεῖσα ἔτι ἔτεκεν υἱόν. (*a*) and (*b*) are directly imitated from the Hebrew, (*a*) being far the commoner (109 exx. as against 9 of (*b*)).

The verb may be either active or middle, the instances of the two voices are nearly equal (60 : 58): προσθήσω and προσθήσομαι (προστεθήσομαι) alternate, but the mid. aor. προσεθέμην preponderates (προσέθηκα mainly in the later historical books, Gen. xviii. 29, Jd. viii. 28 B, xi. 14 B etc., 3 K. xvi. 33, 2 Ch. xxviii. 22, Dan. O x. 18). 1 K. only uses the mid. (προσέθετο with simple inf. 12 times): the Min. Proph. only the act. (προσθήσω or προσθῶ c. inf. with τοῦ 9 times).

There are also a few examples of an absolute use of the verb: Job Θ xx. 9 ὀφθαλμὸς παρέβλεψεν καὶ οὐ προσθήσει, (? Θ) xxvii. 19, Θ xxxiv. 32, Sir. xix. 13, xxi. 1. In the N.T. Luke again imitates the LXX, having three examples of (*a*), xx. 11 f. προσέθετο πέμψαι, Acts xii. 3 προσέθετο συλλαβεῖν and one of (*c*), xix. 11 προσθεὶς εἶπεν παραβολήν. The use of (*a*) is the only Hebraism which has been detected in Josephus[1].

An analogous use of ἐπιστρέφειν (= שוּב) followed by (*a*) inf. or (*b*) καί + finite verb is restricted to Theodotion, Aquila and portions of the LXX having affinities with the style of those translators: in some passages possibly the verb keeps its literal meaning: (*a*) Dt. xxx. 9 ἐπιστρέψει Κύριος...εὐφρανθῆναι, 2 Es. ix. 14 ἐπεστρέψαμεν διασκεδάσαι ἐντολάς σου, xix. 28, Eccl. i. 7, v. 14 ἐπιστρ. τοῦ πορευθῆναι, (*b*) 2 Ch. xxxiii. 3 ἐπέστρεψεν καὶ ᾠκοδόμησεν, cf. Mal. i. 4, Dan. Θ ix. 25 ἐπιστρέψει καὶ οἰκοδομηθήσεται "shall be built again." Cf. a similar use of ἐπανέρχεσθαι c. inf. in Job (? Θ) vii. 7.

Elsewhere שוּב in this sense is rendered by πάλιν alone (Gen. xxvi. 18, xxx. 31 etc.) or with a verb, πάλιν πορεύεσθαι, βαδίζειν etc.

A few other verbs are similarly used with an articular inf. in place of an adverb: πληθύνειν 2 K. xiv. 11, 4 K. xxi. 6

[1] W. Schmidt *De Flav. Ios. elocutione* 516.

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC

(the punctuation in Swete's text needs alteration), 2 Ch. xxxiii. 6, xxxvi. 14, 2 Es. x. 13, Ψ lxiv. 10, lxxvii. 38, Am. iv. 4 (once with a participle, on the model of *λανθάνειν*, 1 K. i. 12 *ἐπλήθυνε προσευχομένη*: contrast the rendering *ἐπὶ πολύ* Is. lv. 7): *μεγαλύνειν* Ψ cxxv. 2, Jl ii. 21: *ἐθαυμαστώθη τοῦ βοηθηθῆναι* 2 Ch. xxvi. 15 B "was marvellously helped": *διεκλέπτετο...τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν* 2 K. xix. 3 "came in stealthily" (contrast *κρυβῇ ἀπέδρας* Gen. xxxi. 26): *ἐσκλήρυνας τοῦ αἰτήσασθαι* 4 K. ii. 10 "hast made thy request a hard one," cf. Ex. xiii. 15 *ἐσκλήρυνεν Φ. ἐξαποστεῖλαι ἡμᾶς* (but perhaps the meaning is rather "hardened himself [cf. vii. 22 B] against sending" than "hardly sent us"): cf. *ταχύνειν τοῦ (ποιῆσαι)* Gen. xviii. 7 etc.

The classical language had used verbs like *λανθάνειν* and *φθάνειν* with a participle in a similar way: in the later language the participle with *(προ)φθάνειν* was replaced by an inf.: the constructions given above may be regarded as a sort of extension of this use.

Other examples where the imitation of the Hebrew affects the structure of the sentence are the use of a question to express a wish, e.g. 2 K. xviii. 33 *τίς δῴη τὸν θάνατόν μου ἀντὶ σοῦ*; (R.V. "Would God I had died for thee"), and—more striking—the rendering of כי in adjurations = "(I say) that" by *ὅτι*, e.g. 1 K. xx. 3 *ζῇ Κύριος καὶ ζῇ ἡ ψυχή σου, ὅτι καθὼς εἶπεν ἐμπέπλησται* (contrast the rendering of כי by *εἰ μήν*, a form of adjuration attested by the papyri, in Gen. xxii. 17, xlii. 16, and its omission ib. xxii. 16). Similarly אם, which in adjurations represents an emphatic negative, the imprecatory words being left to the imagination, is literally rendered, e.g. 1 K. xix. 6 **Ζῇ Κύριος, εἰ ἀποθανεῖται.**

Among cases where the usage of the Hebrew and the Greek vernacular coincide are the use of *δύο δύο* and the like in distributive sense, the use of *εἷς* as an indefinite article, and the

coordination of sentences with καί. In other cases, as in the frequency of ἰδού, the influence of the Hebrew merely brought into prominence a word which held a subordinate position in the classical language.

One instance of a flagrant violation of Greek syntax stands by itself, namely the use of ἐγώ εἰμι *followed by a finite verb*, e.g. Jd. v. 3 B ᾄσομαι ἐγώ εἰμι τῷ κυρίῳ, vi. 18 ἐγώ εἰμι καθίσομαι. This use, however, is limited to a very small portion of the LXX, namely Jd. (B text five times, A text once) and Ruth (once), the βδ portions of the Kingdom Books (11 times), and Job Θ xxxiii. 31 (and perhaps Ez. xxxvi. 36 A). It also occurs in Aquila. The explanation of this strange use has been given elsewhere[1]. It is due to a desire to discriminate in the Greek between the two forms taken by the Hebrew pronoun of the first person, אנכי and אני. The observation of the fact that אנכי is the form usually employed to express "I am" led to the adoption of the rule, at a time when a demand for pedantically literal translation arose, that it must *always* be rendered by ἐγώ εἰμι, while ἐγώ alone represented אני. The rule reminds one of Aquila's use of σύν to express את the prefix to the accusative: the solecism is quite unlike the Hebraisms found elsewhere in the LXX, and the portions in which it occurs (if they are not entirely the work of Theodotion) may be regarded as among the latest additions to the Greek Bible.

§ 5. The Papyri and the Uncial MSS of the LXX.

It is proposed in this section to consider how far the uncial MSS of the LXX, B in particular, can be trusted, in the light of the new evidence afforded by the papyri, in some matters of orthography and accidence. Have the MSS faithfully preserved the spelling and the forms of the autographs or at

[1] *J. T. S.* VIII. 272 f.

least of an age earlier than that in which they were written, or have the scribes in these matters conformed to the practice of their own age? The question has already been raised in the case of the N.T. MSS by Dr J. H. Moulton, who points out that "there are some suggestive signs that the great uncials, in this respect as in others, are not far away from the autographs" (*Prol.* 42). But this conclusion, if established in the case of the N.T., does not *ipso facto* apply to the LXX, where the autographs are much earlier, at least three centuries earlier in the case of the Pentateuch, than the autographs of the N.T. books.

The present writer, for the purpose of this work, has analysed and tabulated the evidence of numerous collections of papyri which have been edited by their discoverers or custodians in England or on the continent. The ground has already been traversed by others, notably by Deissmann and J. H. Moulton: but the principal object which those writers had in view was the illustration of the N.T., and an independent investigation for LXX purposes may not be useless, even if it merely serves to corroborate the conclusions of earlier explorers in this field. Moreover, fresh materials have accumulated even since the appearance of Moulton's *Prolegomena*: the *Hibeh Papyri* have largely increased the number of documents of the age when the Greek Pentateuch came into being[1].

These papyri provide us with a collection of *dated* documents of a miscellaneous character, written by persons of all ranks in the social scale, educated and uneducated, covering a period of more than a millennium[2]. Documents of the

[1] All collections published before 1907 known to the present writer have been investigated, except that the later volumes of the huge Berlin collection have not been completely examined for the period i/ to iv/A.D. The hundreds of documents for that period which have been consulted are, however, sufficient to establish certain definite results. The recent (1907) volumes of Tebtunis Papyri (Part II) and British Museum Papyri (Part III) have not been used.

[2] HP 84 (*a*) is dated 301—300 B.C. The last will and testament of

Byzantine period are not very numerous, but for LXX purposes these may be neglected. Down to the fourth century of our era, the date of Codex Vaticanus, we have a nearly continuous string of documents exhibiting Greek as it was written and spelt by all classes of the community in Egypt during seven centuries. There is only one rather unfortunate gap. Papyri of i/B.C. and of the early part of i/A.D. are sadly scanty. The early part of ii/B.C. is also not very largely represented. On the other hand, iii/B.C. is now richly illustrated (by the Hibeh and Petrie Papyri, the Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus etc.), as is also the period 133—100 B.C. (chiefly by the Tebtunis Papyri), and from about 50 A.D. onwards there is practically no missing link in the catena of evidence.

With this large mass of dated evidence covering such an extensive epoch in our hands, it ought to be possible to trace some clear indications of change and development, no less in matters of orthography and grammatical forms, than in formulae and modes of address[1], and to gain thereby some criterion whereby to test the trustworthiness in these respects of our oldest uncial MSS of the LXX. A few of the clearest instances of such development will here be considered together with their bearing on the LXX uncials. We begin with an instance which has not been noted by Moulton and which affords a more certain criterion than the one which he places in the forefront of his discussion (*Prol.* 42 f.). To Moulton's instance—the use of ὃς ἄν and ὃς ἐάν—we will revert later.

Abraham, bishop of Hermonthis (BM i. 77), is a specimen of writing in viii/A.D.

[1] E.g. the closing formula in correspondence, which, in the Ptolemaic age, according to the status of the person addressed, is ἔρρωσο (to an inferior or an equal) or εὐτύχει (to a superior). From i/A.D. διευτύχει usually replaces εὐτύχει. In iii/A.D. we have the more elaborate ἐρρῶσθαι (ἐρρ. σε) εὔχομαι, still further extended in iv/A.D. by the addition of πολλοῖς χρόνοις.

(1) Οὐθείς (μηθείς) *and* οὐδείς (μηδείς)[1].

The form οὐθείς (μηθείς) is one which we are in a position to trace from its cradle to its grave. First found in an inscription of 378 B.C., it is practically the only form in use throughout the Greek-speaking world during iii/B.C. and the first half of ii/B.C. In 132 B.C. the δ forms begin again to reassert themselves, and the period from that date to about 100 B.C. appears to have been one of transition, when the δ and θ forms are found side by side in the same documents. For i/B.C. we are in the dark, but in i/A.D. we find that οὐδείς has completely regained its ascendancy, and by the end of ii/A.D. οὐθείς, which still lingers on in i/–ii/A.D., mainly in a single phrase μηθὲν ἧσσον, is extinct, never apparently to reappear, at all events not within the period covered by the papyri.

Let us first take the evidence of the Attic inscriptions, as given by Schwyzer-Meisterhans (ed. 3, 259).

	οὐθείς (μηθ.)	οὐδείς (μηδ.)
From 450 to 378 B.C.	0	12
„ 378 „ 300 „	23	34
„ 300 „ 60 „	28	0
Under the Roman Empire	5	18

The latest dates in the first column are two of ii/–iii/A.D. The entire absence of οὐδείς from the inscriptions for over 250 years (300–60 B.C.) is most remarkable.

The evidence of the papyri is in general agreement with this, but enables us to trace the use of the two forms rather more closely between 300 and 100 B.C.

(Where there are several instances of a form in the same document, the number of examples in that document have not been counted: in these cases the figure is followed by +: where there are several documents which repeatedly use the same form, ++ has been added.)

[1] Cf. Mayser 180 ff.

	οὐθείς (*μηθ.*)	*οὐδείς* (*μηδ.*)
iii/B.C. from c. 301 B.C.	21+	2[1]
ii/B.C.	51++	20++(all except one[2] after 132 B.C.)
i/B.C.	1[3]	4[4]
i/B.C.–i/A.D.	1[5]	1
i/A.D.	3[6]	29++
i/–ii/A.D.	0	4++
ii/A.D.	7[7] (of which 3 are *μηθὲν ἧσσον*)	68++
ii/–iii/A.D.	0	9+
iii/A.D.	0	25++
iii/–iv/A.D.	0	1
iv/A.D.	0	26++

During the period of transition (132—100 B.C.), in which both forms are largely represented, we have the following examples of their occurrence in one and the same document: Act. I. col. 1 (131—130 B.C.) *μηθέν* but *οὐδένα*, Teb. 72 (114—113 B.C.) *μηθέν μηδέν*, Teb. 27 (113 B.C.) *μηθέν passim* but *μηδένα*, AP 31 (112 B.C.) *μηθέν* beside *μηδέν οὐδένα οὐδενός*, BU 998 (101—100 B.C.) *μηθέν* but, more than once, *μηδένα*. It appears that *θ* retained its hold more tenaciously in the neuter nom. and acc. than elsewhere.

The results which clearly emerge are that at the time when the Pentateuch and portions at least of the Prophets and the Kethubim were rendered into Greek *οὐθείς* was practically universal. *Οὐδείς* began to be rehabilitated somewhere about the time when the son of Sirach, who could refer[8] to Greek versions of "the law...and the prophecies and the rest of the

[1] PP ii. 20, col. 3 *οὐδέν* 252 B.C., ib. 44 *μηδείς* (undated, but apparently iii/B.C. like the rest of the collection).

[2] BM i. 42 *μηδέν* 172 B.C.

[3] GH 36 *οὐθέν* 95 B.C.

[4] BU 1001 *μηδένα* 56—55 B.C.: ib. 543 *μηδέν* 28—27 B.C.: ib. 1060 *μηδένι* 14 B.C.: BM ii. 354 *μηδέν* c. 10 B.C.

[5] BU 1058.

[6] BM ii. 256 (*a*) 11—15 A.D.: ib. 181, 64 A.D.: FP 91, 99 A.D. (the first and the third in the same phrase *οὐθὲν ἐνκαλῶ*).

[7] *Μηθὲν ἧσσον* OP iii. 492, 130 A.D., ib. 495, 181—189 A.D. (the latest date for *θ*), ib. 504, ii/A.D.: also ib. 497 *μηθείς* "early ii/A.D.," 504 and 530, ii/A.D.: BU 638, 143 A.D.

[8] Sir. prol.

books," settled in Egypt. On the other hand, at the date when Codex Vaticanus was written, οὐθείς was as obsolete as to Englishmen of to-day is the spelling "peny," which only recently disappeared from our Prayer-book.

We turn then to the LXX to test the uncials and obtain the following statistics.

	(1) -θεὶς in all MSS	(2) -θεὶς -δεὶς v.ll.	(3) -δεὶς in all MSS
οὐ-	38	68	167
μη-	3	12	52
Total	41	80	219

It is obvious that the later spelling largely preponderates, and it is fairly certain that it must in many cases have replaced an earlier οὐθείς. Yet, even so, there remain 41 cases where this archaism, as it was in the fourth century, has kept its place in all the oldest uncials, that is in nearly 12½ per cent. of all the passages where the words occur, while in 121 passages out of a total of 340 it has left its trace in some of the MSS. There is a strong probability that, where the readings vary (i.e. in all passages included in column 2), οὐθείς is the older form, as the natural tendency of the scribes was to replace it by the spelling with which they were familiar.

It must further be remembered that some of the Greek books (e.g. Ecclesiastes, Daniel Θ) were not written till after the time of Christ, and in such books οὐδείς was no doubt written in the autographs. It is necessary, therefore, to examine the LXX evidence in greater detail. We obtain the following results.

(1) Οὐθείς is to some extent represented, with or without a variant οὐδείς, in the majority of the books.

(2) Three books alone, which use the pronoun more than

once, contain οὐδείς in all passages in all the uncials: these are Proverbs[1] (17 examples), Ecclesiastes (6), 4 Maccabees (15). In each of the following books the pronoun is used once only, and the uncials read οὐδείς: Judges (xiv. 6), K. βγ (2 K. xii. 3), Ezekiel (xliv. 2), Baruch (iv. 12).

(3) Books where οὐθείς is found throughout in all MSS are 3 Kingdoms (iii. 18, xviii. 40, 43) and 2 Chronicles (ix. 20, xxxv. 3).

(4) Books where οὐθείς has preponderant attestation are Genesis, Leviticus, Joshua, 1 Kingdoms, Jeremiah (both parts).

(5) Οὐδείς preponderates in most of the other books, including Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Isaiah, and Minor Prophets; in all of these, however, οὐθείς finds some attestation.

From the last sentence it seems fairly clear that the uncials cannot be altogether relied on: the Greek Pentateuch certainly goes back into iii/B.C., and the Greek Prophetical Books are probably not later than ii/B.C., and the autographs must almost certainly have contained οὐθείς: the three examples in the papyri of οὐδείς before 132 B.C. prevent us from speaking more positively.

The books mentioned under (2) above deserve notice as regards dates. The Greek Ecclesiastes is probably Aquila's work, a second century production, and 4 Maccabees is generally regarded as written in i/A.D.[2] The δ forms are, therefore, what we should expect to find in the autographs. In the third book, Proverbs, the δ forms attested throughout by BℵA doubtless go back to the original translator. *This suggests a date* not earlier than 132 B.C., *probably not earlier than* 100 B.C., *as the date when Proverbs was translated.*

The Greek Sirach, we know from the statement in the prologue, was written in the period of transition (132—100 B.C.), and we are therefore not surprised to find the uncials uniting in support first of the one form, then of the other: the autograph

[1] But xxiv. 21 μηθετέρῳ Bℵ (μηδ. A).

[2] The last part of Baruch also belongs to the close of i/A.D.

probably contained both forms. The same fluctuation holds good in Wisdom (οὐδείς i. 8 BNA; οὐθείς ii. 4 BNA; οὐδείς ii. 5 BNA; οὐθέν iii. 17 BNA etc.); and we are tempted to refer that book to the same epoch.

In the N.T. it is only what we should expect when we find that οὐθείς, which was expiring in i/A D., is limited in WH text to seven instances (5 in Luke's writings, 1 each in 1 and 2 Corinthians).

(2) Τεσσαράκοντα—τεσσεράκοντα.

Dr J. H. Moulton[1] has already called attention to the "dissonance between N.T. uncials and papyri" as regards these forms, and his statement applies with greater force to the LXX uncials. The substitution of ε for the first α in τεσσαράκοντα seems to have come into existence in some parts of the κοινή speech earlier than in others. Schweizer[2] quotes instances of τεσσεράκοντα, τέσσερες, etc., as early as iv/–iii/B.C. in Pergamene inscriptions, and he regards these forms, which are attested in Herodotus, when found in Asiatic territory, as survivals from the old Ionic dialect. On the other hand, in Egypt the form τεσσεράκοντα hardly appears before i/A.D. and does not become common till ii/A.D., from which date it is used concurrently with the classical form. Τεσσαράκοντα is universal in the Ptolemaic papyri. The earliest attested example of the ε form in Egypt, if it can be trusted, is on an inscription of *circa* 50 B.C., *Archiv* I. 209, δεκατέσ]σερα. Next comes τεσσεράκοστος BM ii. 262, 11 A.D., and τεσσεράκοντα once or twice in i/A.D.: on the other hand I have counted 15 examples of τεσσαράκοντα in papyri of i/A.D. From the beginning of ii/A.D. ε becomes more common. The ε in the second syllable of parts of τέσσαρες is much rarer. BU 133, 144–145 A.D., δεκατέσσε[ρα] is the earliest which I have noted, followed by GP 15 ("Byzantine") τεσσέρων.

[1] *Prol.* 46. Cf. *CR* xv. 33, xviii. 107 and Mayser 57, 224.
[2] *Gramm. d. Perg. Inschr.* 163 f.

Yet, though it is clear that the autographs in at least the majority of the LXX books must have contained *τεσσαράκοντα*, the form which is practically universal[1] in the uncials is *τεσσεράκοντα*. Here, then, we have an instance where the spelling of the uncials has been accommodated to that of a later date than the time of writing: the MS spelling may have come down from ancestors earlier than iv/A.D., but it is not likely to be older than i/A.D.

(3) Ταμεῖον and similar forms.

Moulton (*Prol.* 45) speaks of the coalescence of two successive *ι* sounds as "a universal law of Hellenistic phonology" and states that "*ταμεῖον*, *πεῖν* and *ὑγεία* are overwhelmingly attested by the papyri." Perhaps it was owing to their chief interest lying in N.T. study, that neither he nor Deissmann (*BS* 182 f.) has noticed the contrast in this respect between papyri dated B.C. and those dated A.D. Mayser's list (92) shows that the longer forms *ταμιεῖον*, *ὑγίεια*, *Ἀμμωνιεῖον* etc. were those commonly written in the Ptolemaic age.

For *ταμιεῖον*—*ταμεῖον* (or Ταμ. as a street name in Arsinoe) the papyri give the following statistics:

	ταμιεῖον	*ταμεῖον* (*-ῖον*)
iii/B.C.	11[2]	0
ii/B.C.	1[3]	0
i/B.C.	0	0
i/A.D.	0	4[4]
ii/A.D.	1[5]	6 (or 8[6])

[1] The exceptions are Cod. E in Gen. v. 13, vii. 12 bis, xviii. 28 (*σαράκοντα* sic) bis: 2 Es. xv. 15 A, xvii. 67 ℵ, Ψ xciv. 10 RT, Cod. V four times in 2—3 Macc., once (3 M. vi. 38) being joined by A. [Cod. 87 has the *α* form in Dan. O iii. 47 and one of the correctors of B (usually B[b]) generally alters the *ε* to *α*.] Against these examples must be set some 140 instances where *τεσσεράκοντα* is read by all the uncials.

[2] Add to Mayser's examples HP 31 c. 270 B.C. (six examples), PP i. 32 (1) 5 iii/B.C.

[3] AP 53, 114 B.C.

[4] The earliest is CPR 1, 83—84 A.D.

[5] BU 106, 199 A.D.

[6] Including OP iii. 533, ii/—iii/A.D., OP iv. 705, 200—202 A.D.

In iii/ and iv/A.D. only the shorter form is attested.

For *ὑγίεια* Mayser quotes five exx. from records dated ii/ and i/B.C., 99 B.C. being the latest date cited. *Ὑγεία* appears to begin in the papyri early in ii/A.D., e.g. OP iii. 496, 127 A.D., ib. 497 "early 2nd cent." *Πεῖν* also makes its appearance in the same century[1]. The same distinction between the early and later papyri holds good of the analogous forms from proper names, *Σαραπιεῖον* etc. (see Mayser, 92, 57). The longer forms are usual down to the early part of i/A.D.: *Σαραπι(ε)ῖον* OP iv. 736, i/A.D., OP ii. 267, 36 A.D. *Σαραπεῖον* makes its appearance in OP i. 110, ii/A.D. Mayser, however, has two examples from the end of ii/B.C. of *Σουχ(ε)ίωι* and cites one of *Ἀσταρτεῖον* from Mai (whose accuracy he questions) as early as 158 B.C.

Turning, now, to the three principal uncial MSS, we find the following statistics for the three words referred to above:

	ταμιεῖον	*ταμεῖον*	*ταμῖον*	Total
B	1[2]	19	18	38
ℵ	—	4	17	21
A	28	6	3	37
	ὑγίεια	*ὑγεία*	*ὑγία*	
B	2[3]	1	9	12
ℵ	—	3	6	9
A	6	—	8	14
	πιεῖν (κατα-)	*πεῖν*	*πῖν*	
B	33	12	—	45
ℵ	14	3	6	23
A	50	—	—	50

Only in the third word (as to the spelling of which papyrus evidence fails us) is there preponderant evidence in all the MSS

[1] Exx. from ii/A.D. are quoted in *CR* xv. 37, 434, xviii. 111, with two exx. of *πιεῖν* from i/A.D. An early ex. of abbreviation (*διασεῖν* = *-σείειν* i/B.C.) is cited in Moulton's *Prol.* 45.

[2] Ez. xxviii. 16. [3] Ez. xlvii. 12, Est. ix. 30.

for the longer form. In the other two words B and ℵ present forms which, in the light of the papyri, can hardly be regarded as original: in the first case A preserves the form which was probably in the autographs, but the general character of the A text leaves it doubtful whether this spelling has been handed down unaltered from those autographs or whether it is merely a literary correction (i.e. that the sequence was ταμιεῖον—ταμεῖον—ταμιεῖον). At all events in the Bℵ text we again have grave reason to doubt the antiquity of the MS orthography.

(4) If, however, we have seen reason in the last two examples to question the trustworthiness of the orthography of Codex B, there are, on the other hand, cases where the forms in use in the uncials carry us back to a period far earlier than the dates at which they were written and tell us something of a parent MS from which all the uncials, or a certain group of them, have descended. The phenomena to which attention will here be drawn point to a conclusion of considerable interest: they seem to indicate, beyond a doubt, the existence at a very early time, if not actually as early as the autographs themselves, of *a practice of dividing each book, for clerical purposes, into two nearly equal portions. Probably each book was written on two rolls*[1].

The clue to this discovery, in the case of two (or perhaps three) books of the Pentateuch, is afforded by the form which the particle takes in the indefinite relative ὃς ἄν (ὃς ἐάν) and kindred phrases, e.g. ἡνίκα ἄν (ἡνίκα ἐάν). If the reader will be at the pains to go through the examples of ὃς ἄν (ὃς ἐάν) etc. in the Books of Exodus and Leviticus in the Cambridge Manual Edition, he will obtain the following results. (The forms ὅπως ἄν, ὡς ἄν, ἕως ἄν, which in these books are invariably so written, are excluded from the investigation.)

[1] The subject has been dealt with more fully in an article by the writer in *J. T. S.* ix. 88 ff.

		ὃς ἄν etc.	ὃς ἐάν etc.	Total
Exodus.	Part I. (i. 1—xxiii. 19)			
	B	7 exx.	14 exx.	21
	A	11	10	21
	F	7	8	15
	Part II. (xxiii. 20—end)			
	B	19	0	19
	A	17	1 [1]	18
	F	16	1 [1]	17
Leviticus.	Part I. (i. 1—xv. 33)			
	B	21	32	53
	A	24	27	51
	F	39	14	53
	Part II. (xvi. 1—end)			
	B	48	7 [2]	55
	A	44	8 [2]	52
	F	45	9 [2]	54

The noticeable point is that whereas, in the first half of either book, both forms are attested, ὃς ἐάν receiving rather the larger support, in the second part ὃς ἐάν entirely disappears in Exodus (excepting one passage in AF), while in Leviticus it is very sparsely represented. The examples, it should be said, are spread over the whole of the two books. The break in Exodus comes between xxiii. 16 (ὧν ἐὰν σπείρῃς BAF) and xxiii. 22 (ὅσα ἂν ἐντείλωμαι BF (ὅσα ἐντέλλομαι A)...ὅσα ἂν εἴπω BAF), and there can be little doubt that xxiii. 20 marks the beginning of Part II. In Leviticus the break comes towards the end of chap. xv., probably at the actual close of it, though, as BAF have ὃς ἄν in xv. 33, it might be placed at xv. 30.

The evidence indicates that all three MSS are descendants of a MS in which Exodus and Leviticus were both divided

[1] xxxiv. 24 ἡνίκα ἐάν AF (ἡνίκα ἄν B).

[2] Three examples occur in the last seven verses of the book (xxvii. 28 BAF, 29 BAF, 32 BAF). Excluding these the numbers are reduced to 4, 5, 6. Only in these closing verses do BAF unite in reading ὃς ἐάν.

into two nearly equal parts, which were transcribed by different scribes: the scribe of the second half of both books wrote ὃς ἄν, the scribe of the first half probably wrote both ὃς ἄν and ὃς ἐάν.

In Numbers something of the same kind may be traced in AF, which, after the Balaam episode, contain no examples of ὃς ἐάν: B* however has this form in both parts (though in Part II. it is twice corrected by B^{ab} to ὃς ἄν, xxx. 9, xxxiii. 54). If the book be divided at the end of chap. xxiv., we obtain the following results:

	Part I. (i. 1—xxiv. 25)		Part II. (xxv. 1—end)	
	ὃς ἄν etc.	ὃς ἐάν etc.	ὃς ἄν etc.	ὃς ἐάν etc.
B	17	16	7	6
A	25	12	12	0
F	28	13	12	0

This change in orthography in these books of the Pentateuch does not appear to correspond to a change of translators. The evidence of the papyri makes it possible to suppose that the two spellings go right back to the autographs, although they show clearly that the forms ὃς ἐάν etc., did not become common till the end of ii/B.C. My statistics for the use in the papyri of the two forms (the materials have grown since Moulton's *Prolegomena*[1] appeared) are as follows:—

	ὃς ἄν etc.	ὃς ἐάν etc.
iii/B.C.	43++	(?) 4[2]
ii/B.C.	32+	6[3]
i/B.C.	3	6+
i/A.D.	5+	39
ii/A.D.	13	79++
iii/A.D.	5	13+
iv/A.D.	7	12++

[1] *Prol.* p. 42 f. Cf. *CR* xv. 32.

[2] HP 96. 10 and 28 ὧι ἐὰν ἐπέλθηι, 259–8 B.C. (N.B. ἐὰν ἐπέλθηι, hypothetical, occurs in the same context, line 9): ib. 51. 3 ἃς [ἐ]ὰν, 245—244 B.C.: PP ii. 39 (g) ? iii/B.C.

[3] None earlier than 133 B.C., the earliest being BM ii. 220 col. 2, lines 6 and 8 (reading doubtful), followed by G 18. 27, 132 B.C.

Ὅς ἄν was, thus, the usual form in iii/–ii/B.C. down to 133 B.C., when ὃς ἐάν begins to come to the front, and from i/B.C. onwards the latter is always the predominant form: the figures in both columns decrease in iii/–iv/A.D., when the use of the indefinite relative in any form was going out of use[1].

Similar phenomena present themselves in quite another part of the LXX, namely in the Psalter. Here again we find a distinction as regards orthography between the first and the second half of the book. The tests which have been found in this book (three) are more numerous than in the Pentateuch: on the other hand the only MS affected in all three instances is B: T keeps the same orthography throughout, while the evidence for ℵA is not quite conclusive as to their derivation from a parent MS which contained the two methods of spelling. The break appears to come at the end of Ψ 77, but there are at least two Psalms in Part I. (20 and 76) where the spelling is that ordinarily found in Part II. The three tests are (1) the insertion or omission of the temporal augment in εὐφραίνειν, (2) nouns in -εία or -ία, (3) the interchange of αι and ε.

(1) The evidence is as follows:

Part I.	Ψ xv. 9	ηὐφρ.	BAU	εὐφρ.	ℵ
	xxix. 2	„	B*ATU	„	ℵ
	xxxiv. 15	„	BA	„	ℵ
	xliv. 9	„	BℵAT		
	lxxii. 21	„	Bℵ*		
	[lxxvi. 4	„	T	„	Bℵ]
Part II.	lxxxviii. 43	„	T	„	BℵA
	lxxxix. 14	„	T	„	BℵA*
	14	„	T		
	xci. 5	„	T	„	BℵA
	xciii. 19	„	A	„	T
	xcvi. 8	„	AT	„	Bℵ
	civ. 38			„	BℵAT
	cvi. 30	„	AT	„	ℵ
	cxxi. 1			„	ℵAT

[1] In Exodus a further distinction between Part I. and Part II. is seen in the use of ἐναντίον in the former, ἔναντι in the latter.

(2) *δυναστία* xix. 7 B*, lxiv. 7 B*T, lxv. 7 B*ℵ, lxx. 16 B*, 18 B*ℵ, lxxiii. 13 ℵ*, lxxvii. 4 B*T, 26 B*ℵ as against *δυνασ*τ*εία* [xx. 14 B*ℵAU] lxxix. 3 B, lxxxviii. 14 BA, lxxxix. 10 BℵA, cii. 22 B, and so B, sometimes joined by A, in cv. 2, 8, cxliv. 6 (with T), 11, 12, cxlvi. 10, cl. 2. There is a similar change in the case of *εὐπρεπ(ε)ία*, *μεγαλοπρεπ(ε)ία*: chap. xx. in its spelling of the last word again goes with Part II.

(3) Examples of *αι* for *ε* in the 2nd pers. plur. of verbs, in *παιδίον* (=*πεδίον*) and twice in *μαι*=*με* (xlii. 2 B*A, lviii. 2 B*ℵ) occur in B in xxiii. 7, 9, xxix. 5, xxx. 25, xxxi. 11 bis, xxxii. 1, 2, xxxiii. 9, xlii. 2, xlvii. 13, 14 bis, xlviii. 2, lvii. 3, lviii. 2, lxi. 4, 11, lxiv. 12, lxvii. 5, lxxv. 12, lxxvii. 12 (from xxix. 5 to xlviii. 2 B is joined by A)—examples of the reverse change in ix. 22 (with A), 23, 24, xiii. 3, xiv. 4 (with A), xliv. 8, liv. 22, lxxi. 7 (with T), lxxiv. 6 (with T). After chap. lxxvii. there appear to be no examples of this interchange in Cod. B.

Now, there is nothing to shew that the Greek Psalter is the work of more than a single translator: on the contrary the whole book is marked by a somewhat peculiar vocabulary. Here we have an instance of a division of clerical labour merely. But it is just possible that the two spellings go back to the autographs. The interchange of *ε* and *αι* begins in the papyri in ii/B.C.[1], when it is distinctly vulgar: it does not become common till ii/A.D. At all events the division of the Greek Psalter into two parts goes back at least to a MS of i/–ii/A.D.

The close resemblance existing between the cases which prove the existence of a practice of dividing the O.T. books into two parts, whether for purposes of translation (Jerem. Ezek.) or of transcription, is very remarkable. In at least five cases, representing all three divisions of the Hebrew Scriptures, this practice has been traced. In each case the division is made roughly at the half-way point without strict regard to subject-matter: in each case Part I. is slightly longer than Part II. and—what is specially noticeable—the excess of Part I. over Part II. in the Hebrew of the MT is practically a fixed quantity,

[1] The only example B.C. of *αι* for *ε* which I have noted is FP 12. c. 103 B.C. *τραπαιζίτου* (noted by the editors as "an early example"): the B.C. examples noted of *ε* for *αι* are *ἀνύγετε* Par. 50, 160 B.C., *ὁρᾶτε* ib. I. 386, ii/B.C. Mayser 107 adds a few more.

namely about one fifteenth of the whole book: that is to say, if each of these books were divided into fifteen equal sections, Parts I. and II. would be found to comprise about eight and seven sections respectively. The following statistics, in which the pages are those of an ordinary printed Hebrew Bible, and the books are arranged in order of length, will show what is meant.

		No. of pages.	Total.	Excess of Part I. over Part II.
Psalms	Part I.	$50\frac{1}{2}$	$93\frac{5}{6}$	$7\frac{1}{6}$
	Part II.	$43\frac{1}{3}$		
Jeremiah	Part I.	49	$92\frac{1}{2}$	$5\frac{1}{2}$
	Part II.[1]	$43\frac{1}{2}$		
Ezekiel	Part I.	$44\frac{1}{3}$	$83\frac{1}{3}$	$5\frac{1}{3}$
	Part II.	39		
Exodus	Part I.	$38\frac{1}{2}$	$72\frac{1}{4}$	$4\frac{3}{4}$
	Part II.	$33\frac{3}{4}$		
Leviticus	Part I.	27	$50\frac{1}{3}$	$3\frac{2}{3}$
	Part II.	$23\frac{1}{3}$		

A final instance may be quoted where B appears to preserve a spelling older than itself. In 3 Kingdoms B twice only writes *οὐκ ἰδού* (viii. 53, xvi. 28 c) as against ten examples of *οὐχ ἰδού*. The two passages, however, where the aspirate is not inserted are absent from the M.T. and are perhaps later glosses. B has preserved the differing spellings of the glossator and of the earlier text.

The preceding investigation will serve to show the use to which the papyri evidence, when duly tabulated, can be put, and how necessary it is, at each step in a work such as this, to take account of it. If we sometimes find that all MSS, including B, have been influenced by the later spelling, there are other instances which carry us back to a date not far removed from the autographs, if not to the autographs themselves.

[1] Excluding the last chapter which is a later addition in the Greek: cf. p. 11.

ORTHOGRAPHY AND PHONETICS.

§ 6. The Vowels.

1. Any attempt to determine the spelling adopted in the autographs of the LXX, as in those of the N.T., is beset with great difficulty, and, in the present state of our knowledge, finality is impossible, notwithstanding the assistance now afforded by the papyri. At the time when our oldest uncials were written (iv/–vi/ A.D.) and for centuries earlier there was no fixed orthography in existence. Changes had taken place in pronunciation which gradually made themselves felt in writing. In particular the diphthongs had ceased to be pronounced as such, and scribes now wrote indifferently αι or ε, ει or ι, οι or υ, having nothing to guide them in their choice but any acquaintance which they happened to possess with classical models. If we attempt to go behind the spellings which we find in the uncials, we are met by two unsolved problems. (1) No certain criteria have yet been reached for distinguishing dialectical and local differences, if such existed, within the κοινή. (2) The birthplaces of our uncials are still a matter of dispute.

These gaps in our knowledge are rather less serious to a student of the LXX than to the N.T. investigator, because in the Greek Old Testament we have no reason to doubt that we are concerned with writings which emanate with few, if any, exceptions from a single country, namely Egypt: and for that

country the papyri supply us with evidence covering the whole period from the time of writing to the dates of the uncials.

Moreover, the palaeography of Codices ℵ and A (which, as Mr W. E. Crum points out, is closely akin to that of many of the older Coptic hands), as well as the appearance in these two MSS of certain orthographical phenomena—particularly as regards the interchange of consonants (§ 7. 2)—which have been traced to peculiarities of Egyptian pronunciation, make the Egyptian *provenance* of these two MSS extremely probable. On the other hand, the birthplace of B is more doubtful. Egypt, Rome, South Italy and Caesarea are rival claimants to the honour of producing it: the last-named place is that which has recently found most favour. Yet, if Tischendorf's identification of one of the hands of ℵ with that of the scribe of B may be trusted, the two MSS must apparently have emanated from the same country.

The probability of the Egyptian extraction of A and ℵ should, one would suppose, lend their evidence a peculiar interest. Yet the generalisation suggested by the available data is that B is on the whole nearer to the originals in orthography as well as in text. Cod. A contains much that we can recognize as characteristic of, if not peculiar to, Egypt, sometimes even modes of writing which are characteristic of the earlier Ptolemaic age (e.g. ἐμ μέσῳ, ἐγ γαστρί). More often, however, it is the case that the spellings found in A and in ℵ are shown by the papyri to have come into fashion in Egypt only in the Imperial age and may therefore be confidently attributed to later copyists. In orthography and grammar, no less than in text, A is generally found to occupy a secondary position in comparison with B. ℵ is marked by a multitude of vulgarisms which have obviously not descended from the autographs and deprive this MS of any weight in orthographical matters which its apparently Egyptian origin might seem to lend to it.

In addition to the changes in spelling due to altered pronunciation there are others which have a psychological basis (influence of analogy, etc.). The latter are the more important, but even the 'itacisms' so-called have their interest and may throw light on the history and character of the MSS, when tried by the standard of documents, of which the date and country are known.

2. Interchange of vowels.

Ă > E. The weakening of ă to ε[1] frequently takes place where the vowel is followed by one of the liquids (ρ, λ), especially ρ. In the first two instances to be mentioned the change takes place only under certain conditions.

We have already examined the forms *τέσσερα*, *τεσσεράκοντα*, etc. in the light of the papyri and seen reason to doubt their existence in the LXX autographs (§ 5, p. 62 f.): a few words must however be added here as to the origin of these widely-attested forms. Long before the Hellenistic age Ionic Greek had adopted the forms with ε in the second syllable, *τέσσερες*, *τέσσερας*, *τέσσερα*, *τεσσέρων*, *τέσσερσι*, also *τεσσεράκοντα*. The LXX MSS on the other hand keep the α in *τέσσαρες*, *τεσσάρων*, *τέσσαρσι*, while commonly writing *τέσσερα*[2], *τεσσεράκοντα*. This is not a case of Hellenistic Greek directly taking over Ionic forms: some other principle must be found to account for the discrimination. The masc. acc. in the LXX is either *τέσσαρας*[2] or *τέσσαρες* (= nom.): the latter is the constant form of the acc. in the B text of the Octateuch and occurs sporadically elsewhere in B as well as in A and (twice) in ℵ.—The origin of *τέσσαρες* = acc.[3] is doubtless mainly due to assimi-

[1] Perhaps due to Coptic (Egyptian) influence: Thumb *Hell.* 138, 177, Dieterich *Untersuch.* 11.

[2] *Τέσσαρα* in the B text only in Jer. Ez. and Minor Prophets (Jer. xv. 3, Ez. i. 6 BA, 8 BA, Zech. i. 18, vi. 1). The same group writes masc. acc. *τέσσαρας*.

[3] See Moulton *Prol.* ed. 2 p. 243 f. for the predominance of this form in business documents.

lation of acc. to nom. plur., of which there are other instances (§ 10, 15): but the *frequency* of this assimilation in the numeral appears to be due to the weakening influence of the liquid. The nom. conversely appears twice in the B text of 2 Esdras (ii. 15, 64) as τέσσερας. The rule appears to be that ᾰ cannot retain its place both before and after ρ: one of the vowels must be weakened to ε: in τέσσερα τεσσεράκοντα the first α was altered, in τέσσαρες = acc. assimilation to the nom. suggested alteration of the second.

The same influence is seen at work in the papyri in the transition from Σαρᾶπις (Ptolemaic age) to Σεραῖπις (Roman age): Mayser 57 quotes two examples only of Σεραπιεῖον before the Roman age. Σεραῖπις and τέσσερα appear to have come into general use together, about i/A.D. Cf. περά for παρά (i/B.C.). Mayser 56.

3. In the verb καθαρίζω Cod. A in 14 passages[1] has -ερ- for -αρ-, but, with the exception of N. xii. 15 καθερισθῇ A (read ἐκαθαρίσθη with BF), only where there is an augment or reduplication: ἐκαθέρισα, ἐκαθερίσθην, κεκαθερισμένος, but always καθαρίζω[2], καθαριῶ, καθαρίσασθε -ίσαντες etc.

B only once has -ερ-, 2 Es. vi. 20 ἐκαθερίσθησαν B*A, ℵ never: F has it in Lev. viii. 15, Q in Ez. xxiv. 13, V three times in 1 and 2 Macc., always preceded by an augment.

In this instance the prefixing of a syllable with ε appears to produce the change: assimilation of first and third syllables and the weakening force of ρ upon the vowel are jointly responsible. The avoidance of the sequence of the vowels ε- α- α where the second α is preceded or followed by ρ observable in the two examples quoted (τέσσερα, ἐκαθέρισα) is curious[3].

4. Connected with the preceding exx. is a group of words[4],

[1] As against seven with ἐκαθαρ. κεκαθαρ.

[2] The sub-heading καθερίζω in Moulton-Geden s. v. is therefore misleading.

[3] Cp. Dieterich *op. cit.* 8. Dr J. H. Moulton suggests that the verb was popularly regarded as a compound of κατά, and ἐκαθέρισα is an example of double augment.

[4] Thumb *Hell.* 75 f. regards the ε forms as Ionic and thinks that

in which the ancient grammarians pronounce the forms with α to be Attic, those with ε Hellenistic: the vowel is in most cases followed by a liquid. In a few words containing υ (μυελός, πύελος, πτύελον) the ε form is said to be Attic, the α form Hellenistic. LXX prefers the ε forms, viz. (for Attic μιαρός etc.) it has μιερός[1] and compounds, μυσερός[2], σίελ(ος)[3] and σιελίζειν, ψέλιον[4] (Att. ψάλιον): also (with Attic according to the grammarians) μυελός[5], πτύελ(ος)[6]: similarly ψεκάς[7] for Attic ψακάς. On the other hand LXX retains the Attic α in κύαθος, ὕαλος[8], φιάλη. The MSS are divided as to ἀττέλεβος (BN: the Ionic form) and ἀττέλαβος (AQ) in Na. iii. 17.

The words σκι(α)ρός, χλι(α)ρός, ψί(α)θος are absent from LXX.

5. For ἕνεκα > ἕνεκεν see § 9, 8. Assimilation of vowels produces πέντες = πάντες 2 Ch. xiv. 8 A (so τετεγμένος Μεκεδόνος ἐδέφους etc. in Ptolemaic papyri). Analogy of -ω verbs accounts for forms like ἐδύνετο 4 M. ii. 20 A, analogy of the imperfect for forms like ἔδωκες Ez. xvi. 21 A (so in the papyri).

6. E > A. The reverse change of ε to α is less common: two formations in -άζω may be mentioned. Ἀμφιάζω takes the place of classical ἀμφιέννυμι: the verb occurs four times only, in two, Job xxix. 14, xxxi. 19, all the uncials have ἠμφιασάμην (-ίασα), in 4 K. xvii. 9, Job xl. 5, B keeps the class. aor. with ε (A, NA having the later form). Πιάζω is used

Hellenistic Greek arrived at a compromise between these and the Attic forms: in modern Greek the α form has prevailed.

[1] So Cod. A always (with μιεροφαγεῖν -φαγία -φονία) in 2 and 4 M. (the only two books which use the word) except in 2 M. vii. 34: N has -ε- six times, V once.

[2] Lev. xviii. 23, BAF.

[3] 1 K. xxi. 13 τὰ σίελα, Is. xl. 15 ὡς σίελος: προσσιελίζειν Lev. xv. 8 BA (-σιαλ- F).

[4] So in a papyrus of iii/B.C.: otherwise the Ptolemaic papyri have Attic forms only, Mayser 16.

[5] Gen. xlv. 18, Job xxi. 24, xxxiii. 24: but μυαλοῦν Ψ lxv. 15.

[6] Job vii. 19 (τὸν πτ.), xxx. 10.

[7] Job xxiv. 8, Cant. v. 2.

[8] Job Θ xxviii. 17.

along with the Attic πιέζω "press," but takes on another meaning, "seize" (§ 24 s.v.).

The MSS A and ℵ afford other examples, mainly due to assimilation. A has λακάνῃ Jd. v. 25, ταλαμῶνι 3 K. xxi. 38, ἀρωδιός 'heron' Ψ ciii. 17 (ἠρωδ. T: ἐρωδιός BℵR was the usual form, but there is early authority for ῥωδιός, and the initial vowel may have been an aftergrowth). ℵ has e.g. σαραφείν Is. vi. 6, τάσσαρας Jer. xxv. 16, ἀνυπνιάζεσθαι ib. xxxvi. 8.

Preference for the first aor. forms accounts for words like ἀναλάβατε Jer. xxvi. 3 A, ἔβαλας etc. (§ 17, 2), confusion of aor. and fut. inf. for ἐκφεύξασθαι 2 M. ix. 22 V (=fut. inf.: similar confusion in the papyri from ii/B.C., Mayser 385).

7. A and H. The following exx. of ᾱ where η might be expected are noticeable. (1) Ἀρεταλογία, Sir. xxxvi. 19, "the story of thy majesty" (Heb. הודך: scribes have misunderstood the word and corrupted it to ἆραι τὰ λόγια: the word ἀρεταλόγος appears first in the κοινή, where it means a prater about virtue, a court-jester or buffoon). (2) Μαρυκᾶσθαι is so written (not μηρ.) in both passages, Lev. xi. 26 = Dt. xiv. 8, μηρυκισμὸν οὐ μαρυκᾶται: the subst. is always μηρυκισμός. (So (ἀνα)μαρυκᾶσθαι, Ep. Barn. 10, but subst. μηρυκισμός, ἀναμηρύκησις Aristeas 153 f., 161.) (3) Ὀσφρασία (= class. ὄσφρησις) is a ἅπ. λεγ. in Hos. xiii. 7 BA (ὀσφρησία Q) coined from the late verb ὀσφράομαι for ὀσφραίνομαι.

Thumb (*Hell.* 66 f., cf. 61) mentions ἀρεταλόγος and μαρυκᾶσθαι among the few instances of κοινή forms which appear to be of Doric origin. Another "Doric" κοινή form quoted by Thumb is δίχαλον: LXX uses only the verb διχηλεῖν. LXX similarly uses only κυνηγός, ὁδηγεῖν -ός, never ὁδαγ. as in some N.T. MSS. Ῥάσσω is the LXX form of ἀράσσω, which is not used (α before ρ tends to be dropped or weakened to ε): it is not an alternative for ῥήσσω ῥήγνυμι.

8. The Hellenistic (Ionic) inf. χρᾶσθαι appears in 2 M. vi. 21 A beside Attic χρῆσθαι ib. iv. 19, xi. 31, Est. viii. 11 etc.: the Ptolemaic papyri have both forms (Mayser 347).

The LXX MSS have only the regular forms ἀναλίσκειν, ἀνάλωσις with α in the second syllable; in the Ptolemaic

papyri, however, the augment has invaded all parts and derivatives of the verb: *ἀνηλίσκειν*, *ἀνηλωτικός* etc. are usual, and *ἀνήλωμα* is almost universal down to ii/A.D., when *ἀνάλωμα* begins to reassert itself (Mayser 345 f.). The extensive use of these forms under the Ptolemies excites suspicion as to the trustworthiness of the uncials.

9. A and O. Βιβλιαφόρος Est. iii. 13, viii. 10 (corrected by ℵ$^{c.a.}$ to *βιβλιοφ.*) is supported by Polyb. iv. 22. 2 and a papyrus of 111 B.C. *βυβλιαφόροις* (Mayser 102, 61) and by the similarly-formed *βιβλιαγράφος*, in which the first half of the compound seems to be the neuter plural: but *βιβλιοθήκη*, *βιβλιοφυλάκιον*.

Illiterate scribes confused *α* and *ο*, much as *α* and *ε* were confused: assimilation and the weak pronunciation of *α* in the neighbourhood of a liquid account for many examples (Mayser 60 f.). So *μολλον* (=*μᾶλλον*) Is. liv. 1 ℵ: *μετοξύ* (for *μεταξύ*) 3 K. xv. 6 A is a curious example, found in the papyri from i/A.D. (BM^2 177. 11=40 A.D., OP^2 237 col. v. 11=186 A.D., AP App. I. Pt. I. iii. (c)=iv/A.D.), apparently due to false etymology (*ὀξύς*). Conversely *βαρρᾶ* (for *βορρᾶ*) Jer. vi. 1 ℵ: cf. *βράματα* (for *βρώματα*) Jl. ii. 23 ℵ.

10. AI and A. LXX writes *κλαίω*, not the old Attic *κλάω*, and *καίω*: for the few exx. in the MSS of *κλάω κάω* (rare in Ptol. papyri, Mayser, 105) see § 24 s.v. Αἰεί (Epic and Ionic) appears in 1 Es. i. 30 B, elsewhere the Attic *ἀεί*, and always *ἀετός*.

11. AI and E. Some time before 100 A.D. *αι* ceased to be pronounced as a diphthong and was pronounced as *e*. The interchange of *αι* and *ε*, which resulted from the change in pronunciation, begins c. 100 A.D. in the Attic inscriptions[1]. At about the same date the interchange becomes common in the Egyptian papyri, although the beginnings of it may be traced back in the vulgar language to the second century B.C.[2]

[1] Meisterhans 34.

[2] Mayser 107 cites half a dozen examples of *ε* for *αι*, less than a dozen of *αι* for *ε*, from Ptolemaic papyri, mainly illiterate, beginning about 161 B.C.

The change seems to have begun in final *-αι* *-ε* in verbal forms.

The appendices to the Cambridge Manual LXX afford innumerable instances of this change, which must, however, be mainly attributed to later scribes. Cod. ℵ, in particular, abounds in spellings like *τες ημερες=ταῖς ἡμέραις* in the prophetical books. B is more free from such spellings especially in the historical books, but even this MS has nearly 300 examples (mainly of final *-αι* for *-ε* or final *-ε* for *-αι*), which can hardly all go back to the autographs. The statistics for B, collected from the Appendices to the Cambridge LXX, show a curious rise in the frequency of this usage from the Historical Books to the Psalms group and from this to the Prophetical group. The Pentateuch has 24 examples in all, Joshua to 2 Esdras only 11, the Psalms[1] and Wisdom group 63, the Prophets 188.

A few of the more frequent examples may be noted. *Ἐξέφνης* has preponderant support as in N.T. (B 6 out of 8 times, A 8/10, ℵ 4/6): *ἐφνίδιος* (*-ίως*) is read by A in 2 and 3 Macc., but *αἰφνίδιος* is certainly original in W. xvii. 15. The proximity of one of the liquids specially tends to convert *αι* into *ε* (the liquid having the same weakening effect as in *τέσσαρα* > *τέσσερα*): hence frequent examples in B, often supported by ℵA, of forms like *ἔρετε* (=*αἴρετε*) *ἐρετίζει* (=*αἱρετ.*) etc., and of *ἔλεον=ἔλαιον*. It may be noted that among the few Ptolemaic examples of this interchange other than in final *-αι* *-ε* occur *αὐθεραίτως=αὐθαιρέτως*, *ἔλεον=ἔλαιον* (Mayser 107). The reverse change takes place in *παιδίον*[2]*=πεδίον*, which is common in B and A. An idiosyncrasy of B is *αἴδεσμα=ἔδεσμα*, 8 out of 10 times (once in T, Ψ liv. 15). In the circumstances the context alone can show whether e.g. ετεροc=*ἕτερος* or *ἑταῖρος*, ecεcθε=*ἔσεσθε* or *ἔσεσθαι*.

12. AY and EY. The Ptolemaic papyri exhibit only the classical forms *ἐρεννάω ἔρευνα*: *ἐραυνάω ἔραυνα* make their appearance in papyri of i/A.D.[3], and subsequently made way again for the older forms. In the LXX uncials the forms are about equally divided, and once again the papyri suggest that the MSS are not to be relied on as representing the auto-

[1] The examples in the Psalms (31) are limited to the first half, the last being *παιδίῳ* lxxvii. 12 (see § 5, p. 69).

[2] This form supplies the only examples of *αι* for *ε* in the B text of 2—4 Kingdoms (2 K. xvii. 8, 3 K. xi. 29, xvi. 4).

[3] Mayser 113. The earliest example is dated 22 A.D.

graphs[1]. The theories once held that the form ἐραυνάω was a peculiarity of Jewish or of Alexandrian Greek have to be given up: a special association with Egypt is just possible[2].

Cf. κολοκαύει=κολακεύει 1 Es. iv. 31 B and πέταυρον written by correctors of B and ℵ in Prov. ix. 18 (πέτευρον B*ℵ*A seems to have been the older form of the word). The converse, ευ for αυ, is seen in ἐντεῦθα 1 Es. v. 66 A.

13. AY—A[3]. No examples in the LXX uncials have been noted of the dropping of υ in forms like ἀτός (=αὐτός), ἐματήν, ἑατούς etc., which appear from the papyri to have been in vogue in i/A.D. Assimilation accounts for καταγάζειν (=καταυγ.) in W. xvii. 5 B and for τραματίαι (=τραυμ.) in Jer. xxviii. 4, 52 ℵ: the influence of εὔθλαστος probably produced εὔθραστα (=εὔθραυστα) in W. xv. 13 ℵAC.

14. E and H. A prominent instance of ε replacing η is seen in the preference shown by the κοινή for the termination -εμα in a group of neuter nouns which in the classical language ended in -ημα, due apparently to the analogy of cognate words in -εσις (-ετος)[4]. The same preference for the short radical vowel appears in πόμα (like πόσις: class. πῶμα), δόμα, χύμα (class. χεῦμα), and so apparently κρῖμα κλῖμα. Words in -μα and -σις had come to be used with little, if any, difference of meaning (e.g. δόμα, δόσις), and it was natural that they should be formed on the same pattern. H is retained in the neuter where the cognate feminine nouns have it: where the cognates ended in -ᾱσις η is either retained (στάσις, -στῆμα, not -στᾰμα)[5] or shortened to ε, on the model of the majority of these neuter

[1] The statistics are as follows: ἐξ- δι- ερευνάω and the substantives ἔρευνα ἐξερεύνησις are included. B has 13 examples of ευ to 13 of αυ: A 17 ευ, 20 αυ: ℵ 11 ευ, 14 αυ. Passages where the -αυ- forms are strongly attested are Dt. xiii. 14 BA, Jd. v. 14 BA, 1 Ch. xix. 3 BℵA, Ψ *passim*, Prov. ii. 4 BℵA, Wis. vi. 3 Bℵ, xiii. 7 Bℵ, Est. A 13 BℵA, Jer. xxvii. 26 BℵA.

[2] Thumb *Hell.* 176 f.

[3] Cf. J. H. Moulton *Prol.* 47.

[4] Cf. Mayser 65 f., Schweizer *Perg. Insch.* 47 ff.

[5] Ἀνάσταμα should perhaps be read in Or. Sib. 8. 268.

nouns. New words are formed with the short vowel (LXX ἄφεμα, κάθεμα, ἀφαίρεμα). The LXX exx. are as follows:—

with ε	*with* ε *and* η	*with* η
εὕρεμα	ἔψεμα -ημα[2]	βῆμα
θέμα	ἀνάθεμα -ημα[3]	μνῆμα
ἔκθεμα	σύνθεμα -ημα	ὑπόμνημα[6]
ἐπίθεμα	ἀνάστεμα -ημα	ὑπόδημα
παράθεμα	(διάστεμα)[4] -ημα	διάδημα
περίθεμα	σύστεμα -ημα	
πρόσθεμα	(ὑπόστεμα)[5] -ημα	
κατάστεμα[1]		

The two forms ἀνάθεμα ἀνάθημα appear in different senses, the Hellenistic form being used in the translated books for a thing devoted to destruction, accursed (=חרם), whereas the more literary books (Jdth, 2 and 3 Macc.) use the classical form with the classical meaning, a votive offering given for the adornment of a temple. We cannot, however, point to an example of the distinction of meanings being made in a single book, and ἀνάθημα in Deut. (B text) is used to translate חרם, while ἄνθεμα is used by Theocritus of a temple offering (Ep. v. [xiii] 2). In N.T. Luke possibly observes the distinction (Lc. xxi. 5 ἀναθήμασιν WH with Acts xxiii. 14 ἀναθέματι), but there is good authority in the first passage for ἀναθέμασιν[7].

15. Connected with the foregoing words is the form ἀνυπόδετος (five times in LXX), the κοινή form of class. ἀνυπόδητος (once restored by A in Is. xx. 2), on the analogy of (σύν)δετος etc.

16. Two exx. of Hellenistic shortening of η in the verb are referred to elsewhere (§ 18, 1): (1) in the fut. and aor.

[1] 3 M. v. 45.

[2] The former in Genesis (3 times), 4 K. B (twice), Hg. ii. 12, Dan. Θ (once): the latter in 4 K. iv. 38 A, 39 A, 40 BA, Dan. O (once).

[3] Ἀνάθημα Dt. vii. 26 B *bis*, Jdth. xvi. 19 B, 2 M. ii. 13 V, ix. 16, 3 M. iii. 17: elsewhere ἀνάθεμα.

[4] Four times in the A text of Ezekiel.

[5] Twice in A text: 2 K. xxiii. 14=1 Ch. xi. 16.

[6] But ὑπόμνεμα in a papyrus of iii/B.C., PP[2] 9 (5).

[7] See Trench *N.T. Synonyms* 1st series (v) and Lightfoot on Gal. i. 8. Deissmann has shown that ἀνάθεμα="curse" is not confined to "Biblical Greek," ZNTW ii. 342.

of a group of verbs with pure stems, *πονέσω ἐπόνεσα, φορέσω ἐφόρεσα* etc., (2) in the aorist pass. *ἐρρέθην* (presumably due to assimilation, as the long vowel is retained where there is no augment, *ῥηθείς* etc.).

Ἤνυστρον (the form used by Aristophanes) becomes *ἔνυστρον* in the *κοινή*: so in LXX Dt. xviii. 3, Mal. ii. 3.

17. The interchange of *η* and *ε* continued, though less frequent than that of *ω* and *ο*, till about ii/ or iii/A.D., when *η* began to be pronounced like *ι* (Meisterhans 19). It will be noted from the foregoing examples that the short vowel is specially frequent in conjunction with *λ, μ, ν, ρ*. So A has *ἐρεμάζων* 2 Es. ix. 3 (but in the next *v.* *ἠρ.* with B), *κωπελάται* Ez. xxvii. 9, *σελένη* Dan. Θ iii. 62. A also has *ζετεῖν* 1 K. xxiv. 3, B *πεντέκοντα* N. iv. 3.

The examples of the converse lengthening of *ε* to *η* are few. In two adjoining passages in Isaiah another meaning is made possible by the use of the long vowel in B: in xxxii. 4 we must read *προσέξει τοῦ ἀκούειν* with ℵAQ "attend" (B *προσήξει*) and in xxxiii. 6 *ἐκεῖ* with the same MSS (B *ἥκει*). *Πέντη* N. vii. 53 'B^{edit}' (Swete's Appendix) occurs also in a papyrus of iii/B.C. (Mayser 63): this and *πεντέκοντα* above due apparently to assimilation of the two numerals. B has *μετοικησίαν* Na. iii. 10 (confusion of forms in *-ησις* and *-εσία*), A *ἔννηα* 2 K. ii. 30 (so in an illiterate papyrus of ii/B.C., LP pap. C), V *γονυπητίας* 2 M. xii. 24. A writes *Ἰηρεμίας* in 4 K. xxiv. 18, Sir. xlix. 6 and often in Jer., B only once, Jer. xli. 6. For *ἀλώπηκος* etc. see § 10, 20.

18. E and EI. Attic Greek often dropped the *ι* in the diphthong *ει before vowels*, just as it dropped it in the diphthong *αι* (*ἐλάα ἀεί* etc.)[1]. Hellenistic Greek almost always wrote the diphthong, although Ptolemaic papyri still yield sporadic instances of its omission[2].

In the LXX the writing of *ε* for *ει*, in two words where the omission of *ι* is specially common in Attic, is practically confined to literary books. *Πλέον* for *πλεῖον* is certain only in 4 Macc. (i. 8, ii. 6, ix. 30 ℵ): it has good authority in Mal. iii. 14 BAΓ (*πλ(ε)ῖον* ℵQ) and is a v. l. in L. xxv. 51 A,

[1] Meisterhans 40 ff.

[2] Ib. 44: Mayser 67 ff.

W. xvi. 17 ℵC, Sir. prol. 6 ℵ: πλέονα is read by BQ in Am. vi. 2, by ℵ in Sir. xxxi. 12: elsewhere the diphthong is universal before long and short vowels alike[1]. (Derivatives, πλεονάκις πλεονεκτεῖν etc., were always so written.) The writer of 3 Macc. has the adverbs τέλεον i. 22, and τελέως vii. 22 A (but τελείως iii. 26 AV): elsewhere LXX has τέλειος, τελειοῦν etc.[2] The literary translator of Job writes φορβέα for φορβεία "a halter" (xl. 20).

Only in the case of two late derivatives from ἀχρεῖος (which itself keeps the diphthong, 2 K. vi. 22, Ep. J. 15) is there strong evidence for a more general omission of ι[3], viz., ἀχρεοῦν (ἠχρεώθησαν Ψ xiii. 3, lii. 4, Jer. xi. 16, ἀχρεῶσαι 1 Es. i. 53 B) and ἀχρεότης Tob. iv. 13 BA *bis*; ἀχρειοῦν stands in 4 K. iii. 19, Dan. O iv. 11, vi. 20 (1 Es. i. 53 A).

Δωρεά is universal, and had begun to replace the older δωρειά in classical times[4].

19. As regards ε and ει *before consonants*, LXX always has ἔσω, but εἰς (Attic has εἴσω ἐς as well). LXX commonly has ἕνεκεν (ἕνεκα § 9, 8), while εἵνεκεν (Ionic and poet.), apart from Lam. iii. 44 εἵνεκεν προσευχῆς, is curiously confined to the phrase οὗ εἵνεκεν "because" (Gen. xviii. 5, xix. 8, xxii. 16, xxxviii. 26, N. x. 31, xiv. 43, 2 K. xviii. 20 B, Is. lxi. 1 = Lc. iv. 18 quot.), which replaces Attic οὕνεκα.

Οὗ εἵνεκεν for οὕνεκα appears to be due in the first place to the avoidance of crasis in the κοινή, while attraction of the diphthong οὗ may account for the use of the Ionic diphthongal εἵν. (Crönert 114 quotes examples of οὗ εἵνεκα.) Εἵνεκεν is unattested in the Ptolemaic papyri, which have only one example each of εἵνεκα οὕνεκα τοὕνεκα, Mayser 241 f.: in Attic Inscriptions

[1] The Ptolemaic papyri show a great and increasing preponderance of the forms with the diphthong, Mayser 69. The Attic rule was ει before a long vowel (πλείων etc.): before a short vowel either ει or ε, except in the neut. which was always πλέον, Meisterhans 152.

[2] Τελεωθησόμενον occurs in a private letter of 103 B.C. (Witkowski, *Epist. Privatae Graecae*, no. 48, line 18).

[3] Χρέα = χρεία occurs in a papyrus of iii/B.C. (Mayser 68) and on an Attic inscription of iv/B.C. (Meist. 40).

[4] Meisterhans 40.

it appears first in Roman times, Meist. 217: N.T. has three examples of it apart from the quotation in Lc.

20. H and EI. The two examples quoted by WH (ed. 2 App. 158) of change of η to ει call for note also in the LXX. Both appear to be due to the approximation in the pronunciation of η and ει.

Ἀνάπειρος for ἀνάπηρος, "maimed," or more particularly "blind," is the reading of the uncials in the only two LXX passages, Tob. xiv. 2 א, 2 M. viii. 24 AV (Swete ἀναπήρους in the latter passage), and has overwhelming authority in the two N.T. passages (Lc. xiv. 13, 21)[1].

Εἰ μήν in asseverations for ἦ μήν occurs in the papyri from ii/B.C. and is quite common in i/A.D.[2] In the LXX it is abundantly attested[3], the classical ἦ μήν occurring in the uncials only in Genesis (xlii. 16 D), Exodus (xxii. 8, 11), and Job (xiii. 15 BאC, xxvii. 3 אC). Deissmann was the first to point to the papyrus examples of εἰ μήν as exploding the old theory of a "Biblical" blending of the classical ἦ μήν with εἰ μή, the literal rendering of the Heb. form of asseveration אם לא. A further argument against that theory might be drawn from the fact that εἰ μήν renders other Heb. words, viz. כי (in Genesis) and אם, and may be followed by a negative (N. xiv. 23 εἰ μὴν οὐκ ὄψονται). Still εἰ μήν most commonly renders אם לא, and the similarity between it and εἰ μή naturally caused confusion between the two[4]. The Pentateuch written

[1] Cf. the note of WH on Heb. xi. 37 ἐπειράσθησαν, which should probably be corrected to ἐπειρώθησαν=ἐπηρ.

[2] Mayser 78, Deissmann *BS* 205 ff., Moulton *CR* xv. 33, 434, xviii. 107, *Prol.* 46. 112 B.C. is the date of the earliest example yet found. On the other hand papyri of iii/B.C., e.g. the Revenue papyrus of 258 B.C., have ἦ μήν.

[3] Gen. xxii. 17, xlii. 16 AF: N. xiv. 23, 28 BF, 35 B^{ab} AF: Jd. xv. 7 B: 2 K. xix. 35 B: Job i. 11, ii. 5 Bא, xxvii. 3 BA: Jdth i. 12: Is. xlv. 23 א$^{c.b}$ AQ: Bar. ii. 29: Ez. v. 11 B and five times in "Ez. β," xxxiii. 27, xxxiv. 8, xxxv. 6, xxxvi. 5, xxxviii. 19.

[4] So εἰ μή is read by one or more of the uncials for εἰ μήν in N. xiv. 28 (A), 35 (B): Job ii. 5 (A): Is. xlv. 23 (Bא: no equivalent in Heb.): Ez. v. 11

in iii/B.C. may, like the papyri of the same date, have contained ἦ *μήν* throughout in the autographs, and the literary translator of Job no doubt wrote the classical form: the other LXX books all adopted the spelling which was in vogue from ii/B.C.

21. The converse change of ει to η appears in Jd. v. 13 B, *τότε κατέβη κατάλημμα* = *κατάλειμμα* (Heb. "then came down a remnant"): similarly in 4 K. xix. 4 B *λήμματος* = Heb. "remnant" (A *λίμματος*), and in 2 M. v. 20 *καταληφθείς* appears to be intended for *καταλειφθείς* (V* *καταλήμφθης* exhibits the same change in the final syllable). These examples are accounted for by the change of ει to ι, which was then altered to η (see below). BℵA unite in writing *σήσματι* for *σείσματι* in Sir. xxvii. 4: a papyrus of about the date of the Greek Sirach has the word in its usual form[1].

For *εἴρηκα εἴρημαι*=*ἤρηκα ἤρημαι, ἠργασάμην*—*εἰργασάμην* etc. See § 16, 5.

22. E and I. Ἀλεεῖς, as in N.T., always replaces ἁλιεῖς (Is. xix. 8, Jer. xvi. 16, Ez. xlvii. 10), apparently through dissimilation, i.e. from avoidance of the double *i* sound[2]: the change does not take place in *ἁλιέων*, Job xl. 26, or the verb (Jer. xvi. 16, *ἀποστέλλω τοὺς ἁλεεῖς...καὶ ἁλιεύσουσιν*).

Assimilation (specially frequent in the case of two vowels flanking λ μ ν or ρ) accounts for the spelling *σιμίδαλις* (for *σεμ.*) 4 K. vii. 1 A, Is. i. 13 B, lxvi. 3 ℵ and *πιρί* (for *περί*) Is. lii. 15 ℵ (so in papyri of ii/B.C., Mayser 81). The influence of Egypt has been traced in the interchange of *ĭ* and *ĕ* Thumb *Hell.* 138 (Coptic had no short *ĭ*, Steindorff *Kopt. Gramm.* p. 13): but it

(AQ), xxxiv. 8 (Q). In 3 K. xxi. 23 *εἰ μή* BA=אם לא is probably a literalism of the original translator.

[1] Teb. 41. 22 *σείσματα*='extortions,' *c.* 119 B.C.

[2] Blass N.T. § 6, 3: W.-S. § 5, 20 a. The Ptolemaic papyri always have ι in the second syllable, *ἁλιεύς, ἁλιέως, ἁλιέων* and one example of *ἁλιεῖς*, Mayser 82, 269 f.: the originality of the ε form in LXX is therefore uncertain. LXX has no examples of the Latin words in which ε for ι is common in the papyri from i/A.D., *λεγεών* etc.

is to be noted that it is not limited to that country, being found in Asia as well (Thumb ib.).

23. H and I. The change in the pronunciation of *η* from an open *ē* sound to an *ī* sound fell within the period 150—250 A.D., at least within the district of the Attic Inscriptions, in which the mixture of *η* and *ι* begins about 150 A.D.[1] The change may have taken place at a rather earlier date in Egypt, but the Ptolemaic papyri show very few indications of it. It speaks well for the three principal uncials that examples of this interchange of *η* and *ι* are distinctly rare in B and not much commoner in ℵA: they occur most frequently in two late MSS of viii/ or ix/A.D. Γ (Isaiah) and V (1—4 Macc.).

Ἀναπηδύει, Prov. xviii. 4 BℵA = *ἀναπιδύει* is due to an incorrect etymological association of the word with *πηδάω* (see LS s.v. *πιδύω*).

The following examples of confusion of the vowels may be noted as occurring more than once or as occurring in B or as affecting the sense. (1) H > I :—Ἀπορρίξει Lev. xiii. 56 B: *ἱλικία* Sir. xxvi. 17 A with *ἵλικίας* 4 M. viii. 2 A, *ἱλικιώτης* ib. xi. 14 A: *κτίσεως* (for *κτήσεως*) Ψ. civ. 21 ℵAR^{vid}: *ῥιτίνη* Gen. xxxvii. 25 AE, xliii. 11 AF, Jer. viii. 22 A: *σμῖγμα* Est. ii. 9 A (=*σμῆγμα* Bℵ). Here may be added two examples where B, by writing *ει* for *η*, imports a new meaning: *είμεροῦτο* W. xvi. 18 (which might be intended for 'was charmed': read *ἡμεροῦτο*), *εἴξουσιν* Mic. vii. 12 (for *ἥξουσιν* יבואו). (2) I > H. *Οὐχ ἡδίαν* (for *οὐκ ἰδίαν*) Jdth. v. 18 B, so Prov. v. 19 ℵ (in the next *v.* A has *ἦσθι*=*ἴσθι*), cf. § 8, 3: *ἀνακλήσει* (for *ἀνακλίσει*) Cant. i. 12 C: *ἐξεχώρησεν* 1 Es. iv. 44 and 57 A (in act. sense "removed," B *ἐχώρισεν*: a similar confusion *ἐπιχωρίσαντος* for *-ρήσ.* in a papyrus of ii/B.C., Mayser 84): *ἐπιμηγῆναι* 1 Es. viii. 84 B: *μηαινομένη* Jer. iii. 1 B.

24. I and EI[2]. It is needless to dwell long on the interchange of these two methods of spelling. For more than a century before our era *ει* had ceased to be a diphthong: *ι* and *ει* were pronounced alike and scribes had no guide but

[1] Meisterhans 19.

[2] See especially Blass N.T. 6 f., Mayser 87 ff.

classical models to tell them which was the correct method of writing. The alteration in pronunciation thus brought it about that ει and ι could be used indifferently to represent long *i*: the use of ει for ῐ̆ is an indication of greater illiteracy and is more restricted. Some scribes used the old diphthong ει for a new purpose, namely, to indicate long *i* (so generally the scribe of B): others practically dispensed with it or used the two spellings indiscriminately. This use of ει and ι as equivalent does not, however, become common in the Egyptian papyri till ii/B.C.[1]: those of iii/B.C. for the most part observe the classical orthography. The earlier Ptolemaic papyri usually write τιμάω, τιμή, χίλιοι etc. (beside the classical ἔμειξα, τείσω etc.): it is only towards the end of ii/B.C. that τειμή, γείνεσθαι, γεινώσκειν, ἡμεῖν and ὑμεῖν etc. become common. It is thus *a priori* probable that the LXX autographs, at least of the earlier books, preserved the correct classical spelling.

The only rough conclusion that can be drawn with regard to the LXX uncials is that the orthography of B in this matter is more correct and perhaps goes back to an earlier age than that of ℵ and A. In general it may be said that B prefers writing long *i* as ει (e.g. μεικρός, κλείνη, μεισεῖν, ῥείπτειν), and that many of these forms are well attested in papyri of ii/B.C. ℵ, on the other hand, and (to a less degree) A, prefer ι as representing the sound of long *i* (e.g. ἐκῖνος, ἀπέστιλα, ἔμινα, χίρ, τῖχος).

25. It will be noted that in most of the instances cited the *i* sound is preceded or followed by one of the letters λ, μ, ν, ρ: and it might be laid down as a general, though not an exhaustive, rule that B writes λει- μει- νει- ρει- while ℵ writes -ιλ. -ιμ. -ιν. -ιρ. Exceptions to this rule in the case of B are ἀλίφειν, λιτουργεῖν and forms from λείπειν (ἐκλίψει, ὑπελίφθην etc.).

B is fond of writing ι for ει in the dat. sing. of words in -ις, e.g. δύσι κρίσι δυνάμι[2]: on the other hand it almost invariably has ἰσχύει for ἰσχύι.

[1] In Attic Inscriptions the interchange did not make itself widely felt till later, *c.* 100 B.C., Meisterhans 48.

[2] So πόλι βασίλι in III' 110 (270—255 B.C.), παρευρέσι Teb. 5 (118 B.C.)

As regards *ει* for *ĭ* B is not impeccable: *ὅρειον* is frequently attested in this MS[1]; but forms like *ἀληθεινός* are more characteristic of A. Πόλεις for nom. *πόλις* is common in B.

26. As regards abstract nouns in *-εια -ία* the following examples of forms in *-ία* are well attested by the uncials: *ἁγνία* (attested 4/5: by B*AF in N. vi. 2), *ἀκριβία* (attested 5/6: by B*A in Dan. Θ), *ἀσφαλία* (Lev. xxvi. 5 B*, Dt. xii. 10 B*, all uncials in the one example in Ψ, ciii. 5: elsewhere in ℵ, A and V), *δουλία* (well supported throughout: only in three passages *δουλεία* appears unquestionable, 3 K. xii. 4 BA, 2 Es. vi. 18 BA, Jdth. viii. 23 BℵA), *ἑρμηνία* (Sir.), *εὐσταθία* (Est. and Wis.), *ἱερατία* (always attested, by B in Pent., by A in later Hist. books, by BℵA in Sir., by BQ in Hos.), *λατρία* (B* Hex., AℵV 1 M.), *μαντία* (Isaiah), *μεταμελία* (BA in the only passage), *μνία* (BℵA in Jer. *β*), *νηστία* (Ψ and Min. Proph.), *παιδία* (certain in Ψ and Is.), *πλημμελία* (certainly on MS evidence to be preferred to *-λεια*), *πορία* (attested throughout, except in Jdth. ii. 19, but mainly by ℵA), *πορνία* (mainly ℵA, Bℵ in Is. xlvii. 10, BℵA Jer. iii. 2), *πτωχία* (always attested, certain in Ψ and Job Θ), *χηρία*, *ὠφελία* (always attested, certain in Job, Ψ, Jer. *β*). Inferior support (mainly that of ℵ) is given to forms like *ἀπωλία βοηθία δυναστία εὐσεβία* etc.

In the Psalter we have evidence that the orthography in this case goes back to an earlier date than that of B: the book was divided either in the autograph or in an early copy of it into two parts after Ψ 77: the scribe of the earlier portion preferred the forms in *-ία*, the scribe of the latter part wrote *-εια* (see § 5, p. 69).

For the omission of the first *ι* in words in *-ιεῖον -ίεια* see § 5, p. 63 ff.

27. O and E. Assimilation, analogy and the weakening of pronunciation in an unaccented syllable produce some interchange of these short vowels[2].

(1) E > O. The late derivatives from *ὄλεθρος*, first used apparently in the LXX, where they abound, are there, according to the preponderant evidence of the uncials, correctly written

and frequently in business contracts from i/A.D. onwards in the formula *βεβαιώσω πάσῃ βεβαιώσι.*

[1] Possibly to avoid the tribrach. The writing of *ĭ* as *ει* is specially common in diminutives where it is apparently due to a desire to avoid ⏑ ⏑ ⏑. *Βιβλείδιον* is common in the papyri (I have counted seven examples between i/ and iii/A.D.): so *ἀλυσείδιον*, *δακτυλείδιον* etc.

[2] Cf. Meisterhans 22 f., Mayser 94 ff.

(ἐξ)ολεθρεύειν -ευμα -ευσις. The spelling ἐξολοθρεύειν, which has survived in mod. Gk. ξολοθρεύω, and is due to assimilation of the vowels flanking the liquid[1], is quite rare in the first hands of the principal uncials and cannot be attributed to the autographs.

Out of upwards of 250 examples in the LXX B* has only 22 instances of -ολοθρ., A 8, ℵ* 9. The only books where the *o* form is well supported are 3 Kings (ii. 4 B, xii. 24 m B, xvi. 33 B, xviii. 5 B, xx. 21 B^{1} A, as against seven examples where *o* is unattested) and the first half of Ψ (B 5, ℵ 1, A 1): in Jer. xxxi. 8 ἐξολοθρ. has the weighty support of BℵAQ^{2}, elsewhere this book has ἐξολεθρ., though in the simple verb the *o* form is attested in three out of four passages by ℵ or B. The later *o* form is introduced into the Vatican MS with indefatigable regularity by one or more of its correctors. The subst. ὄλεθρος remains constant in this form.

The same change appears in another verb in -εύειν, κατερόμβευσεν, N. xxxii. 13 B (-ρέμβ. AF), where it is due apparently to the influence of ῥόμβος ῥομβέω: for the causative meaning "made to wander," cf. Syntax and contrast Is. xxiii. 16, ῥέμβευσον πόλεις, "wander through."

The ε in the penultimate syllable of τετράπεδος (λίθος), "a squared (or hewn) stone," is usual in Hellenistic Greek in this phrase and in similar adjectives: but τετράποδος is strongly supported in Jer. lii. 4 (B*AQΓ), and is attested in the two other LXX passages, 2 Ch. xxxiv. 11 A, 1 M. x. 11 ℵV^{3}.

(2) O > E. The substitution of ε for *o* in an unaccented syllable is strongly attested in two verbal forms: ἐπελάθεντο

[1] Perhaps we may find a parallel in Attic in the two forms ὀβελός, ὀβολός. The assimilation takes another form in ἐξελεθρεύειν Zech. xiii. 2 ℵ, Ez. xxv. 13 Q^{vid}, 16 Q^{*vid}.

[2] Here perhaps may be traced the hand of the redactor who combined Jer. *α* and Jer. *β*.

[3] The usual Attic adjectives are τετράπους, ἑξάπους etc. The forms in -πεδος (τρίπεδος, ἑξάπεδος, ἑκατόμπεδος etc.) are mainly used of length, as is τετράπεδος in Polyb. 8. 4 (6). 4. But the Heb. מחצב ('hewn') which is rendered by τετρ. in 2 Ch. xxxiv. 11 and the use of τετράγωνος as a synonym in 1 M. x. 11 A (so Jos. *A. J.* xiii. 2. 1) seem to fix the meaning of λίθος τετρ.

= ἐπελάθοντο (Jd. iii. 7 A, Jer. iii. 21 Bא, xviii. 15 BאA, xxiii. 27 Bא, xxvii. 6 אA, xxxvii. 14 א, Hos. xiii. 6 B, Ψ lxxvii. 11 B)[1] and ὀμώμεκα[2] = ὀμώμοκα, 1 K. xx. 42 B, ὀμώμεχα, Ez. vi. 9 A. With ἐπελάθεντο (? on the analogy of ἐτίθεντο) cf. the termination -εσαν which occasionally replaces the more usual -οσαν (κατεφάγεσαν, Jer. x 25 אQ and in papyri ἐλαμβάνεσαν ἀφίλεσαν: see § 17, 5 and 10).

28. O and Ω. The distinction between the long and short vowels, after the formal adoption of ω into the Attic alphabet at the end of v/B.C., is on the whole strictly observed in Attic Inscriptions down to 100 A.D.[3] In Egypt the distinction became obliterated at an earlier date, earlier, it would seem, than in any other province of the κοινή: the papyri of iii/B.C., however, are practically free from the mixture, which only becomes common in ii/B.C., and is then mainly confined to illiterate documents[4]. It is another testimony to the value of the principal uncials that the instances in them of confusion of ο and ω are comparatively rare: it is only in late MSS such as E (Genesis), Γ (Prophets), T (Psalms), and V (Macc.) that it is frequent.

29. A few words claim special notice.

The verb ἀθῳοῦν (a late formation, perhaps coined by the translators, from ἀθῷος, θῳή) in all the 21 passages where it occurs in the uncials takes ο in the second syllable, ἀθοωθήσομαι, ἠθόωμαι etc., apparently owing to the difficulty felt in pronouncing the long vowel twice consecutively[5].

[1] So in Mark viii. 14 B. The regular ἐπελάθοντο in 1 K. xii. 9, Job xix. 14, xxxix. 15 B, Ψ cv. 13, 21, cxviii. 139 and as v. l. in loc. citt.

[2] So ὀμόμεκα ὀμώμεκα in papyri from i/B.C., Mayser 95: add ὀμώμεκα OP[3] 478. 44 (132 A.D.).

[3] Meisterhans 24. There are a few examples of mixture as early as iii/B.C., but it does not become common till Hadrian's time.

[4] Mayser 97 ff. He reckons seven examples of mixture in iii/B.C. (a few more must be added from the Hibeh Papyri) to 140 in ii/B.C.

[5] Ἀθῷος remains unaltered, even where there is a double ω (Jer. ii. 34,

Πρόιμος should be written in all the (eight) passages[1], but πρωινός. The former word means "early" in the year (of rain and fruit), is opposed to ὄψιμος, and is apparently derived from πρό: the latter means "morning" (as in morning-sacrifice, morning-watch), is opposed to ἑσπερινός, and derived from πρωί[2].

Ἀγαθωσύνη, ἁγιωσύνη, μεγαλωσύνη are the forms in use in LXX as in N.T.: T alone (in Psalms) consistently writes -οσύνη: B has μεγαλοσ. in Dan. Θ (iv. 33, v. 19), and B*א* in Zech. xi. 3. Ἱερωσύνη (ἀρχιερωσ.) has also the best authority: in Macc. ἱεροσ. is read sporadically by each of the three uncials. A occasionally writes δικαιωσύνη, treating the αι as a short vowel (3 K. viii. 32, x. 9, Is. i. 26, xxxii. 17).

For the short vowel in πόμα (Att. πῶμα), δόμα cf. 14 above: for ἑώρακα-ἑόρακα[3] § 24 s.v. ὁράω.

30. The remaining examples in Cod. B of the interchange of ω and ο are (unless others have escaped notice) confined, apart from two in Exodus, to the books contained in vol. II. of the Cambridge LXX. (1) Ω>Ο: ἰσοθήσεται Job Θ xxviii. 17. (2) Ο>Ω: καθωμολογήσηται Ex. xxi. 9 (καθωμολογήσεται A: so ἀνωμολογησάτω in a papyrus of ii B.C., Mayser 99), πεπτωκώς (=-κός) Ex. xxiii. 5 (cf. τὸ ἠσθενηκως Ez. xxxiv. 4 A and τὸ γεγονώς in a papyrus of *c.* 115 B.C., Teb. 115. 23), θυρεωφόρος 1 Ch. xii. 24 (to avoid five short vowels: usually -οφόρος or -ᾱφόρος), πώρρω 2 Ch. xxvi. 15, ἀνθωμολόγησις 2 Es. iii. 11 (Σωμωρών B=Σομορών A=Samaria ib. iv. 10), ἀνώνητοι[4] (for Est. E 5), but ἀθόω is read by B in 2 Ch. xxxvi. 5 d, ἀθόων by ℵ in Jer. xix. 4.

[1] In the two where it is used of early figs (Hos. ix. 10, Jer. xxiv. 2) A has πρώιμος.

[2] The distinction between the uses and forms of πρόιμος πρωινός is carefully observed in LXX. Πρώιμος appears to be a later form due to a false etymology, as from πρωί (but see Blass N.T. 22 who, accepting the derivation from πρωί, compares πλώιμος πλόιμος). In Is. lviii. 8 τότε ῥαγήσεται πρόιμον τὸ φῶς σου (כשחר 'as the dawn': Ottley renders the Gk. 'early in the morning') πρωινόν would be nearer the original: the translator seems to have meant 'early,' 'soon' (cf. ταχὺ ἀνατελεῖ which follows) and to have dropped the Hebrew simile.

[3] Ἑόρα 4 M. iv. 24 A.

[4] In Wis. this form improves the metrical balance with the previous

ἀνόν.) W. iii. 11 B*ℵ (and so A in 4 M. xvi. 7, 9). In Sirach the writing of ω for ο is more frequent and goes back apparently to the autograph or to an early copy: prol. 22 *βιωτεύειν* BℵAC, *μεσοπωρῶν* (for *μεσοπορῶν*) xxxiv. 21 BAC(ℵ)[1], *ἄκμωνος* xxxviii. 28 B, *εὐωδία* (for *εὐοδία*) xliii. 26 B and so xx. 9 A, xxxviii. 13 ℵC (*εὐοδία* is confirmed by the Heb. in two of the passages, by the sense in xx. 9 where the Heb. fails), *φωτίζων* (agreeing with *τόξον*) l. 7 Bℵ.

31. In view of what has been said as to the correct use in general of ω and ο in the uncials, their evidence as regards e.g. fut. (or pres.) ind. and conj. gains in importance: in the LXX at least we shall not expect *ἔχομεν* and *ἔχωμεν* to be confused in Cod. B[2]. It is clear, for instance, from the following passages that the Pentateuch translators were fond of using a fut. ind. in the first clause of a sentence, followed by a deliberative conj. in the later clauses: Gen. xxii. 5 *διελευσόμεθα...καὶ...ἀναστρέψωμεν*, xliii. 4 *καταβησόμεθα καὶ ἀγοράσωμεν*, xliv. 16 *Τί ἀντεροῦμεν...ἢ τί λαλήσωμεν ἢ τί δικαιωθῶμεν*; Ex. viii. 8 *ἐξαποστελῶ...καὶ θύσωσιν*.

32. O and Y. The heterogeneous Attic adjective *πρᾶος -εῖα -ύ* has been rendered uniform, *πρᾳύς* replacing *πρᾶος*: the substantive is consequently *πραύτης*, not the older *πραότης* (§ 12, 11).

33. OY and O. Of this interchange (fairly frequent in Ptolemaic papyri, Mayser 116 f.) the uncials yield but few examples. ℵ has *ὀκ* (*ὀχ*) for *οὐκ* (*οὐχ*) (no examples quoted by Mayser) in Is. xl. 16, lviii. 10, Jer. xii. 4, xxii. 12, so F in Ex. vii. 23: ℵ also has *Ἰόδα* Jer. xxxvi. 22. A has *νομηνία* Ex. xl. 1, *δολεία* (=*δουλ.*) Ez. xxix. 18, and conversely *διαβουλῆς* for *διαβολῆς* Sir. li. 2.

34. OY and Ω. *Δῶναι* for *δοῦναι* (on the analogy of *γνῶναι*) Est. ii. 9 B is not attested in the papyri before i/A.D. (FP 109. 4, letter early in i/A.D., *ἀναδῶναι* AP 77. 24, 130 A.D., *μεταδῶναι* OP[2] 123. 11, letter of iii/ or iv/A.D.).

The uncials always write *οὗς*, not *ὦς* (as often in Ptolemaic papyri on the analogy of the oblique cases, Mayser 5).

clause, ending with *ταλαίπωρος*, but it can hardly be original: the writer's sense of rhythm (cf. Syntax) would be sufficiently satisfied by *ταλαΐπωρος—ἀνόνητοι*.

[1] LS cite the same form from Dioscorides.

[2] Contrast Moulton *Prol.* 35 on the text in Rom. v. 1.

35. ΟΥ and Υ. The Ptolemaic papyri offer a few examples of their interchange[1]. In LXX κολλούρα, "a roll" or "cake," κολλουρίς, κολλουρίζειν are read by B in 2 K. xiii. 6, 8, beside κολλυρίς, κολλυρίζειν, κολλύριον in the same MS (as always in A) in 2 and 3 Kingdoms. The two forms are attested in the single N.T. passage (Ap. iii. 18), and elsewhere[2].

Two examples of ου for υ appear close together in Jer., λεπτουνοῦσιν xxxi. 12 B*, λουμενόμενος (=λυμαιν.) xxxi. 18 ℵ*vid, which *may* go back to the compiler of the two portions of the Greek book. B has ἡμίσου for ἡμίσυ Is. xliv. 16 (so in a papyrus of ii/A.D., Mayser 118).

An instance of υ for ου is apparently to be found in λυτρῶνας[3] 4 K. x. 27 BA (for λουτρῶνας, a euphemism for the Heb. 'draught-house': cf. *latrina* = *lavatrina*).

We find also ὑρανοῦ Sir. i. 3 ℵA, δῦλος (=δοῦλος) 1 K. xiv. 21 A, Ψ cxxii. 2 T.

36. ΟΙ > Ι. ℵ has λύχνι=λύχνοι Zech. iv. 2 and apparently ἐμιχῶντο Jer. xxxvi. 23, πιήσατε ib. xlii. 15, A has Φινίκης Is. xxiii. 2. (LXX uses στίχος only, not στοῖχος, for "a row"; and so στιχίζειν (not στοιχ.) "to arrange in a row" Ez. xlii. 3.)

37. ΟΙ > ΕΙ. Δνεῖν is the form assumed by δυοῖν in two literary LXX books, 4 M. i. 28 ℵV (δυοῖν A), xv. 2, Job xiii. 20 =ix. 33 A, as also in late Attic Inscriptions (329—229 B.C.)[4], in a literary papyrus of ii/B.C.[5] and in some literary κοινή writers (Polybius, Strabo, Plutarch). The form seems to reflect a stage in the change in the pronunciation of οι which was on the way to becoming equivalent to υ (cf. 41 infra). It is almost the only vestige of the dual remaining in the κοινή.

[1] Mayser 118, cf. Thumb *Hell.* 193 f. Thumb holds that υ in the κοινή was pronounced in at least three different ways (as German ü, i, u).

[2] Blass N.T. § 6, 4 pronounces the -ου- form to be certainly of Latin origin.

[3] The form is not quoted in LS.

[4] Meisterhans 157.

[5] Mayser 314, where the literature is quoted. Phrynichus sanctions δνεῖν but only as a genitive (Rutherford *NP* § 185).

38. OI and O. The ι in the diphthong οι is sometimes dropped, as it is in αι and ει, before a vowel, both in classical and in κοινή Greek[1]. Ποεῖν for ποιεῖν is the commonest example: the only example noted in LXX is ποῆσε (= ποιῆσαι) Jer. xxxix. 35 ℵ. The loss of the ι before a consonant is unknown in class. and rare in κοινή Greek[2]: B* has ὀκίας (= οἰκ.) Jer. lii. 13, ἀποκία (= ἀποικία) 2 Es. i. 11, ii. 1, x. 8, and τόχοις (= τοίχοις) ib. v. 8.

39. On the other hand, in the κοινή an ι was sometimes inserted between ο and another vowel (α or η), e.g. βοιηθεῖν, ὀγδοιήκοντα, or an original ι in this position, which was dropped in Attic, was retained. Attic Greek wrote πόα, ῥόα, χλόη, ψόα (or ψύα), a muscle of the loins: but ποία (-η), ῥοιά (-ή), χλοίη appear in the dialects, in late Attic and occasionally in the papyri[3]. LXX always has the Attic ῥόα and χλόη. Πόαν should be read in Prov. xxvii. 25 (BℵC, ποίαν A), but ποία in Mal. iii. 2 (BAΓ), and probably in Jer. ii. 22 (B*Q*). Ψόα Lev. iii. 9 and three times in the B text of 2 K. (A ψοία): in Ψ xxxvii. 8 αἱ ψύαι of AT must be the original text (corrupted to αἱ ψυχαί and thence to ἡ ψυχή of Bℵ*).

LXX has no examples of forms like βοιηθεῖν, ὀγδοιήκοντα (found in Attic Inscriptions and Ptolemaic papyri).

40. OI and Ω. ℵ* has ἀνέγνοι (=ἀνέγνω) Is. xxxvii. 14, ἔγνοις ib. xlviii. 8, ἔγνοι 1 M. i. 5. For δοῖς, δοῖ=conj. δῷς, δῷ see § 23, 10.

41. OI and Υ. Οι in the Attic Inscriptions is the last of the diphthongs to lose its diphthongal character: interchange of οι and υ is first found in them *c.* 240 A.D.[4] In Egypt

[1] Meisterhans 57, Mayser 108 f. Ποεῖν etc. appears in Attic Inscriptions in v/B.C. and is common in iv/B.C.: in the papyri its flourishing period is ii/B.C., though the examples of ποι- are even then twice as many as those of πο-: in i/ and ii/A.D. ποιεῖν is replaced by πνεῖν (οι=υ).

[2] Λοπός for λοιπός several times in Tebtunis papyri (end of ii/B.C.), Mayser 109.

[3] Meisterhans 58, Mayser 15, 110.

[4] Meisterhans 58 f.

the equalisation of οι and υ begins considerably earlier, in illiterate papyri of ii/B.C., but does not become frequent till i/A.D.[1] It is noteworthy that the earliest instances in the papyri are also the only examples which, on the authority of the uncials, are deserving of consideration in the LXX.

(i) B* has forms from ἀνύγειν (=ἀνοίγειν) in 2 Es. xvii. 3, Ψ xxxviii. 10, Na. ii. 7 (with ℵ) and Jer. xxvii. 25, and these forms are fairly common in ℵ (and A) in the Prophetical and Wisdom groups: ἀνύγειν is the earliest example of υ for οι in the papyri (160 B.C.: so ὔξει = οἴξει, 99 B.C.).

Συνδοιάσω (for -δυάσω) read by B*A* in Ψ cxl. 4 may be original. B* also has σύ=σοί 1 Ch. xxix. 11 (=לְךָ=σοί A: cf. Dan. Θ Sus. 50 A: the earliest papyrus example noted by Mayser is dated 90 A.D.) and ἀλυφῆς Mic. vii. 11. A and ℵ afford other examples: στυβῆς Jd. xv. 5 A, τύχοις 3 K. vi. 10 A (so in a bank receipt of 112 B.C., Mayser op. cit.), σχῦνος A, σχυνίον and σχύνισμα ℵ, φῦνιξ Sir. xxiv. 14 A, φυνικοῦν Is. i. 18 ℵ etc.

(ii) Of the converse use of οι for υ the only example claiming consideration is λοιμαίνεσθαι for λυμαίνεσθαι, which has strong support in Proverbs (xviii. 23 B*, xxiii. 8 B*C, xxv. 26 B*, xxvii. 13 B*ℵAC: but xviii. 9 λυμ. BℵA) and in Sirach (xxviii. 23 B*ℵ)[2], and is moreover attested in a papyrus dated as early as "about 147 or 136 B.C." (G. 17. 15). A real or supposed etymological connection between λοιμός and λύμη probably accounts for the adoption of this form.

Σοί for σύ is read by BAC in Job xv. 4, by A ib. xxxiv. 17, ℵ ib. xxxv. 2, also by A in Jer. xlv. 24, and by ℵ in 1 Ch. xvii. 27, Is. xxvii. 8, Zech. ii. 2. B has κλοιδωνισθήσονται Is. lvii. 20. Οἰποίσω (for ὑποίσω) occurs in Job Θ xxxi. 23 ℵA and Prov. xviii. 14 ℵ, and these two MSS yield some other examples of οι=υ. F has ἐνδεδοίκει (=ἐνδεδύκει) in Lev. xvi. 23, which appears to be the only example in the uncials in the Pentateuch.

[1] Mayser 110 ff. Dr J. H. Moulton points out to me that in the matter of *pronunciation* the κοινή by no means followed the lead of Attic.

[2] The first hand of ℵ probably wrote this form in Jer. xxxi. 18: "λουμενόμενος ℵ*vid" in the Cambridge edition (App.).

42. Υ and Ι. The change in the pronunciation of *υ* to that of *ι*[1] did not become general in the *κοινή* till about 100 A.D. In two words, however (in addition to some proper names), other causes had before this produced interchange between the two vowels, even in Attic Inscriptions[2]. These words are *ἥμισυς* and *βιβλίον* (*βίβλος*). Assimilation of the unaccented *ι* to the following *υ* produced *ἥμυσυς* (*-συν -συ* : but *ἡμίσεως* etc. where there is no *υ* in the 3rd syllable) as early as iv B.C. : in the Ptolemaic papyri this form predominates in iii/B.C., in ii–i/B.C. *ἥμυσυς* and *ἥμισυς* are represented by nearly equal numbers. LXX has *ἥμυσυ* only in Dan. Θ vii. 25 B, elsewhere *ἥμισυ* : the preference for *ἥμυσυς* in the early Ptolemaic age casts some doubt on the trustworthiness of the uncials.

On the other hand LXX has some examples of assimilation of the 3rd syllable to the 2nd. Ἡμίσει for *ἥμισυ* has good authority at the end of Joshua (xxii. 1 B*, 10 A, 11 B*A, 13 A, 21 A) and is attested by F in N. xv. 9, 10, Jos. ix. 6. Conversely, *ἥμισυ* stands for dat. *ἡμίσει* in N. xxxii. 33 BAF, xxxiv. 13 F, Dt. xxix. 8 A, Dan. Θ ix. 27 BA. B* writes *ἥμισου* for *ἥμισυ* in 3 K. iii. 25, Is. xliv. 16. Cf. § 12, 10.

43. The same doubt attaches to the constant use of the Attic spelling *βιβλίον*, *βίβλος* in LXX (*βύβλος* in 2 Ch. xvii 9 B, Dan. Θ ix. 2 B) in view of the predominance in Ptolemaic papyri of *βυβλίον*, *βύβλος*. Attic Greek had at an early time assimilated the original *υ* in the first syllable of *βυβλίον* to the accented *ι* in the second and *βίβλος* followed suit : there was also perhaps a desire to discriminate between the material *βύβλος* and the papyrus-roll formed from it. In the vernacular in Egypt, from which the word came, this distinction (to judge from the papyri) does not seem to have been generally made. In Is. xviii. 2 *ἐπιστολὰς βυβλίνας* B, "letters

[1] Thumb *Hell.* 139 ff. conjectures that it originated in Phrygia.
[2] Meisterhans 28 ff., Mayser 100 ff.

written on papyrus," is no doubt the true text (*βιβλ.* ℵAQΓ), as is Βυβλίων, Ez. xxvii. 9 B*Q*, the Greek name of Gebal being Βύβλος (Strabo xvi. 755).

LXX, with the Ptolemaic papyri, always writes *μαρσίππιον*, not *μαρσύπιον* (Lat. *marsupium*), which was an alternative way of writing the foreign (? Semitic) word.

44. Μόλιβος is written by the uncials (with variants *μόλιβδος μόλυβος*, § 7, 34), the Epic and *κοινή* form[1] of Attic *μόλυβδος*. Σμιρίτης (-τος A) *λίθος* is the reading of the uncials in Job xli. 6, not *σμυρίτης*, as cited by LS: assimilation of the unaccented vowel accounts for it, if the word is etymologically connected with *μύρον*.

LXX has the Attic *ἁλυκός*, the uncials again conflicting with the papyri, which write *ἁλικός* (on the analogy of other adjectives in *-ικός*)[2].

Other examples, mainly in Aℵ, are due to later scribes. (i) I > Y. A has *γύνεται* (=*γίνεται*) 2 K. xiv. 27, *καθυδρύσαντες* 3 M. vii. 20, *ὑδρυμένη* 4 M. xvii. 3: Γ has *σύντρυμμα* Is. xxii. 4.

(ii) Y > I. ℵ has in Is. *σινωρίδος* xxi. 9, *δάκριον* xxv. 8, *ἀργιρίου* xlviii. 10, *σινήχθησιν* xlix. 18, *ἐρίθρημα* lxiii. 1, in Zeph. *δινατή* i. 14, *ἱπελίφθησαν* iii. 3, in Cant. v. 2 *βόστριχοι*. A* appears to have written *ἀρχίφιλοι* for *ἀρχίφυλοι* 1 Es. ii. 7: C has *ῥείπου* for *ῥύπου* Job xiv. 4.

45. Y (EY) and H (E). Πανουργεύω (not class. *παυουργέω*) is the verb in use (1 K. xxiii. 22) and has the corresponding noun *πανούργευμα* (used in good sense): Jdth. xi. 8 B*ℵ (*-ημα* AB^{ab}), Sir. i. 6 B (*-ημα* ℵAC), xlii. 18 BC (*-ημα* ℵ*A).

46. The following examples in one or other of the uncials of interchange of *υ* (*ευ*) and *η* (*ε*) are due to assimilation of vowels and to the later pronunciation (*υ*=*ι*=*η*):

(i) H > Y: *θῦλυ* Gen. i. 27 D, Lev. xii. 7 A, *ῥύγνυται* 3 K. xiii. 3 A, *θυσαυρούς* Prov. viii. 21 B, *πυλός* (=*πηλός*) Job xli. 21 ℵ, *πολλυ* (=*πολλῇ*) Sir. xviii. 32 A.

[1] In the papyri *μόλιβος* first occurs in i/B.C.: *μολύβδινος* twice in ii/B.C. and *μολυβδ[* in iii/B.C.: Mayser 101.

[2] Mayser 102: *ἁλικός passim* in iii/B.C., the only example quoted of *ἁλυκός* is iii/A.D.

ℵ affords an example of *anaptyxis* (the reverse of syncope) in σάραξ = σάρξ Zech. ii. 13 (cf. Mayser 155). The same MS writes ὁμοροοῦντες (= -ροῦντες) 1 Ch. xii. 40, ἀναγάοντες (= ἀνάγοντες) ib. xv. 28. The LXX does not contain examples of prothetic ι before σ (ἰστήλη εἰστρατιώτης etc.), which appears to be a peculiarity of Asia (Thumb *Hell.* 144 ff., Schweizer 103).

49. Contraction and Syncope.

The κοινή generally prefers contracted forms, and introduces some contractions unknown to the older language. The Attic word for a young bird was νεοττός[1], and this is used by the Atticizing writer of 4 M. (xiv. 15), while two other literary books, Job and Proverbs[2], have the almost equally orthodox νεοσσός. The remaining books have the κοινή vernacular form νοσσός[3]. The derivatives all take the κοινή form : νοσσιά (16 times : νεοσσιά only in N. xxiv. 22 B*), νοσσίον, νοσσεύειν, νοσσοποιεῖν.

The LXX, in common with the Ptolemaic papyri, retains the Attic contracted form νουμηνία in most books (B 26 times, A 29, ℵ 4) : νεομηνία (Ionic) does not make its appearance in papyri or inscriptions[4] till the Roman epoch, and its originality where it occurs in the LXX is therefore extremely doubtful[5].

The coalescence of the two ι sounds in the forms ταμεῖον, ὑγεία, πεῖν has been discussed elsewhere (§ 5 p. 63 ff.), and it was shown from the papyri that the shortened forms found in the LXX uncials can hardly be attributed to the autographs.

of ὤ-κειμαι 'circumambient') which is shortened in the unaugmented tenses from the notion that ὠ contained the temporal augment. The root is *smer* seen in *memor*. There is therefore no connexion between ὀμ. and ἰμείρεσθαι.

[1] Rutherford *NP* 287.

[2] Job v. 7, xxxviii. 41, xxxix. 30, Prov. xxiv. 22[e], 52.

[3] So all the uncials in Dt. (three times), and B in all the dozen other passages, while A, *more suo*, introduces the Attic form (νεοσσός). ℵ twice sides with B, once with A.

[4] Mayser 153 (example of 191 A.D.), Nachmanson 69 (earliest example 213 A.D.). Lobeck (ap. Rutherford *NP* 225) "Νεομηνία...perrarum est etiam in vulgari Graecitate."

[5] N. xxviii. 11 B, 1 K. xx. 5 BA, 18 A, 4 K. iv. 23 BA, 1 Ch. xxiii. 31 BA, 2 Ch. ii. 4 A, Ψ lxxx. 4 (all uncials), Ez. xxiii. 34 B.

The hypothetical particle retains its usual classical form ἐάν in LXX as in the papyri[1]. The form ἄν, used by some literary writers (Plato, Thuc.), is practically confined in LXX to two phrases where there is crasis or elision (κἄν, οὐδ' ἄν) and to a small group of books (Wisdom, Sirach, 4 Macc., Isaiah)[2]. The only instance of its use apart from καί or οὐδέ is Tob. xiii. 16 ℵ μακάριος ἔσομαι ἂν γένηται. Ἐάν also frequently supplants the indefinite particle ἄν after a relative pronoun etc. (ὃς ἐάν etc., see § 5, p. 65 ff.).

The LXX retains the uncontracted forms, usual in Attic prose, in ἔαρ, στέαρ, ἐλεεινός.

For κανοῦν and ὀστοῦν ὀστᾶ (but ὀστέου -έων -έοις) see § 10, 8: πηχῶν § 10, 21: ἀργυροῦς etc. § 12, 2: ἡμίσους § 12, 10: contracted comparative adjectives in -ων § 12, 21: ἀργός (ἀεργός Prov.) § 12, 2.

50. LXX uses only the *syncopated forms* καμμύειν[3] = καταμύειν (Is. vi. 10, xxix. 10, xxxiii. 15, Lam. iii. 45: B καμβ. in the first and last of these passages) and σκόρδον[4] = σκόροδον (N. xi. 5). (Δίφορον read by BF^{corr} in Dt. xxii. 9, where AF* have διάφορον, which is also read by BAF in the parallel passage, Lev. xix. 19, may be taken, not as an example of contraction but as an alternative rendering, = "bearing fruit twice a year," of כלאים.)

Other syncopated forms in the uncials are ὑπερδεῖν (=ὑπεριδεῖν) 1 Es. ii. 18 B*, so ὕπερδες (=ὑπερεῖδες) Zech. i. 12 ℵ*: ἀκούσμεθα (=ἀκουσόμ.) 2 Es. xxiii. 27 ℵ*, ἐπιχθήσονται (=ἐπιχυθήσ.) Job xxxvi. 27 ℵ*, ἔλαλσεν (=ἐλάλησεν) Is. xxxvii. 22 B*,

[1] Meisterhans 255 (only 6 examples of ἄν in Attic Inscriptions from v/ to iii/B.C.): Mayser 152 f.: Moulton *Prol.* 43 note 2.

[2] κἄν Lev. vii. 6 B, W. iv. 4, ix. 6 (xiv. 4, xv. 12=καί), Sir. iii. 13 B, ix. 13, xiii. 23, xiv. 7, xvi. 11, xxiii. 11, xxx. 38 [but καὶ ἐάν ib. xxxvii. 12, xxxix. 11, xli. 9 ὅτι], 4 M. ii. 8, 9, x. 18, xviii. 14 [quoting Is. xliii. 2 which has καὶ ἐάν], Is. viii. 14 B. Οὐδ' ἄν 4 M. v. 30, x. 4, xvi. 11, Is. i. 12.

[3] Condemned by Phrynichus (Rutherford *NP* 426).

[4] So Ptolemaic papyri, Mayser 146: in Attic Inscriptions from ii/A.D., Meisterhans 69.

πατοῦσν (=πατοῦσιν) ib. xlii. 5 ℵ*, παρδόθη (=παρεδόθη) Jer. xxvii. 2 B*.

The MSS occasionally write a single *a* in transliterating proper names for the more usual double vowel: Ἀρών (= אהרן) Cod. A in Ex. vi. 26, vii. 8 (so vii. 1 F), N. xii. 10, Sir. xlv. 6, Tob. i. 7: Ἰσάκ Gen. xxvii. 1 A, Ex. ii. 24 B, Sir. xliv. 22 BℵJdth. viii. 26 B, and ℵ in 1 Ch. xvi. 16, Ψ civ. 9, 4 M. xiii. 12, 17, xvi. 20, 25, xviii. 11. (The distinction between Ἀβράμ=אברם and Ἀβραάμ=אברהם is strictly observed in Genesis.) The prophet is always Ἱερεμίας but a syncopated form Ἱερμ(ε)ιά Ἱερμίας is used of others of the name (יִרְמְיָה יִרְמָיָהוּ) in 1 Ch. and 2 Es.: cf. Ἱρουσαλήμ Jer. ii. 28 ℵ.

§ 7. The Consonants.

Interchange of consonants.

1. The consonants in the *κοινή* are subject to fewer widespread changes than the vowels. The general adoption of σσ for Attic ττ and such individual phenomena as the temporary substitution of οὐθείς for οὐδείς, the omission of the second γ in γίγνεσθαι and γιγνώσκειν, and the insertion of μ in the tenses of λαμβάνω (λήμψομαι etc.) are features which distinguish the *κοινή* as a whole from the classical language.

2. Phonetic changes, however, produced some new spellings which have a more limited range in the vernacular: consonants belonging to the same class are interchanged, gutturals with gutturals, dentals with dentals, etc. An interest attaches to some of these, because they appear to be confined to certain localities, and they have been attributed to idiosyncrasies in the pronunciation of the native languages of the countries in which they are found. In particular, the interchange of τ and δ and of κ and γ is specially characteristic of Egypt[1]. The examples of such changes in the LXX uncials

[1] Thumb *Hell.* 133 ff., with two papers in *Indogermanischen Forschungen*, vi. 123 ff. (J. J. Hess) and viii. 188 ff. (Thumb). It appears probable that Egyptians, in the early centuries of our era, could not pronounce Greek γ and δ. The evidence is as follows. (1) Hess shows that in demotic papyri of ii/A.D. containing Greek transliterations κ is used as the

have, therefore, a certain value in connexion with the question of their *incunabula*, although it is unlikely that many of them go back to the autographs.

3. **The gutturals.** Κ > Γ. The only example of weakening of κ to γ in the LXX uncials which can confidently be ascribed to the autographs is the form γναφεύς (4 K. xviii. 17, Is. vii. 3, xxxvi. 2), which replaces the older (and apparently original) form κναφεύς in the κοινή[1].

4. In other particulars the evidence of the uncials as regards interchange of these consonants is not supported by the Ptolemaic papyri.

On the one hand the conversion of ἐκ to ἐγ before certain consonants (ἐγ δέ, ἐγβάλλειν etc.) which is common in Attic Inscriptions and almost universal in the Egyptian papyri down to about ii/—iii/A.D.[2], is practically unrepresented in the uncials: ἐγλεκτός in the B text of Ψ civ. 43, cv. 23, and ἐγ γῆς Is. xxxix. 3 ℵ, xlix. 12 A, have been noted. Ἔκγονος is commonly written: ἔγγονος occasionally in Codd. A and ℵ[3]. For the similar absence of assimilation of ἐν cf. § 9, 4. Anomalous forms with γκ for κ are ἐγκλεκτοῖς Jer. x. 17 ℵ*, ἀγκμή 2 M. iv. 13 A.

5. On the other hand A has examples of γ for κ, some of which may indicate the Egyptian origin of that MS, but they are not likely to be older than i/A.D. The commonest example is -δειγνύω etc. which occurs nine times in this MS (Dt. i. 33 with F, Tob. xii. 6, W. xviii. 21, Ep. J. 25, 58, Dan. Θ iii. 44, 2 M. ix. 8, xv. 10, 3 M. v. 26). A also has γνήμην Jd. xv. 8 A (cf. ἀντιγνημίῳ CPR 78, 221—6 A.D.), οἶγον 1 K. v. 5, γαρπῶν Prov. xii. 14, δάγνοντες Hb. ii. 7. ℵ appears to read ἀπογρύψω in W. vi. 22 (see Swete): D has γνηγός Gen. x. 9. The inter-

equivalent of both demotic *g* and demotic *k*. Demotic has no sign for *d*: τ and δ correspond to demotic *t*. (2) In Sahidic the consonants ϫ and ϣ, along with a few others, are rarely used except in Greek words (Steindorff, *Koptische Gramm.* p. 7). (3) In Greek papyri instances occur of interchange of κ and γ (not due, as in Attic γναφεῖον, to the influence of a neighbouring consonant) and of τ and δ.

[1] Mayser 169 f. The initial γ is found already in an Attic Inscription of iv/B.C. (γναφεῖον) Meisterhans 74.

[2] Mayser 226 f. In ii/A.D. the standing formula in the papyri καθάπερ ἐγ δίκης begins to be written καθάπερ ἐκ δίκης.

[3] Is. (xiv. 29 ΑΓ and five times in ℵ: xxx. 6, xlviii. 19, xlix. 15, lxi. 9, lxv. 23), Prov. xxiii. 18 A, Dt. vii. 13 F[vid]. The papyri have both forms.

change of κ and γ, in which Thumb traces the influence of Egyptian pronunciation (*Hell.* 134), only comes to the front in illiterate papyri of i/A.D. (Mayser 170)[1].

6. Γ > Κ. The reverse change is represented in A by *κῆν* (=*γῆν*) 1 K. v. 4, *ἡκούμενος* 3 K. ix. 5 (=*ἠγούμενος* B: Heb. "upon the throne"), *Κοργίας* 1 M. iv. 5. ℵ has *λέκι* (=*λέγει*) Zech. i. 3, *ἀκαλλιώμεθα* Is. xxv. 9. B has *χυτρόκαυλος* 3 K. vii. 24 *ter*, 29 (A *-γαυλος* correctly from *γαυλός* "a milk-pail"). Familiarity with the native country of the founder of Alexandria might account for the appearance of Megiddo as *Μακεδών* 4 K. xxiii. 30 B, *Μακεδδώ* ib. ix. 27 A. One instance which appears with some frequency, *πακίς* for *παγίς* "a trap" or "snare," is partly due to the fact that it is often used to render the Heb. פח which has the same meaning, though the form occurs where other Hebrew words are rendered: B has *πακίς* twice (=פח in both places) Jos. xxiii. 13, Hos. v. 1, ℵ has it 13 times viz. Tob. xiv. 10 *bis* and 11 times in Ψ[2]: as against these 15 passages there are 47 where *παγίς* is read by all the uncials.

7. Χ > Κ (ΚΧ). Confusion between aspirate and tenuis is common in LXX and in the papyri when *θ* follows: in the uncials alteration of aspirate to tenuis is also met with before λ, μ, ν.

Ἐκθρός (found in a papyrus of 118 B.C., Teb. 5, 259) occurs sporadically in each of the three main uncials, B (Mic. iv. 10, vii. 10), ℵ (Na. iii. 11, 13) and A (Job xxxiv. 26, 2 M. x. 26): similarly A has *ἐκθρεῦσαι* 2 M. x. 26, ℵ *ἔκθιστος* 4 M. v. 27. In ℵ and A we more frequently meet with the spellings, paralleled in post-Ptolemaic papyri, *ἐκχθρός -ία -αίνειν*: so once in B*, Bar. iv. 25 (this portion of the book was written in i/A.D.). *Ἐκθές* for *ἐχθές* stands in the A text in 1 K. xiv. 21, xix. 7, 2 K. iii. 17, Job Θ xxx. 3.

Μοκλός is confined to the B text which has 16 examples of it to 19 of *μοχλός*: ℵ has *ἀναμοκλείοντες* 4 M. x. 5. *Κλίδων* occurs in Sir. xxi. 21 A and Is. iii. 20 ℵ. *Ἐκμαλωσία* (for *αἰχμ.*) and

[1] The earliest examples I have noted are as follows:

κ > γ i/A.D. *γυρίου* BU 975 (45 A.D.), *πατριγῆς* and *εὐδογῖ* (=*-κεῖ*) BM ii. 154 (68 A.D.).
ii/A.D. *γρεάγρα* BM ii. 191, *πρόγιται* (=*-κειται*) BU 153.

γ > κ i/A.D. *ὁμολοκῶ* BU 189 (? 7—8 A.D.), *καστροκνημιο* ib. 975 (45 A.D.).
ii/A.D. *ἐπιστρατήκων* ib. 587, *ἀρκυρίου* ib. 416, *διαιέκραψε* (=*διέγρ.*) ib. 662, *ὑτρακωγός* (=*ὑδραγ.*) ib. 71, *ἠκοράκαμεν* ib. 153, *Ἀκρικούλας* BM ii. 189.

[2] Between Ψ x. 6 (where ℵ is joined by R) and xc. 3: at the beginning and end of the book (Ψ ix. 16, 30, cxviii. 110 etc.) ℵ unites with the other uncials in reading *παγίς*.

cognate forms occur nine times in ℵ. B has *λυκνίας* Sir. xxvi. 17, A *καλκοῦ* N. xxxi. 22 (Swete ed. 2 App.).

Κιτών[1] occurs in B* in Ex. xxviii. 35, xxxvi. 35, in ℵ* in Is. iii. 16, 24, xxxvi. 22.

8. *Transposition of the aspirate* or repetition in the second syllable is seen in *κύθρα* (Ionic)=*χύτρα* 1 K. ii. 14 B, Sir. xiii. 2 ℵ (so *κυθρόποδες* Lev. xi. 35 BF) and *χύθρα* N. xi. 8 F, Na. ii. 11 ℵ: *κύθ.* and *χύτ.* in Ptolemaic papyri, Mayser 184. (Κιθών, *χιθών* of the papyri are absent from LXX.)

9. K—X. Ἐκ is occasionally written *ἐχ* before *θ χ φ* in Attic inscriptions and Ptolemaic papyri[2]. So in the uncials (1) *ἐχθέσει* W. xi. 14 ℵAC (RV[mg] 'cast forth *in hatred*' unwarrantably assumes a word *ἔχθεσις*=*ἔχθρα*: the papyri show *ἔχθεσις ἔχθεμα* etc., Mayser 228), *ἔχθεσμος* 4 M. v. 14 ℵ, *ἔχθες* (=*ἔκθες*) Dan. Θ vi. 8 B*A: (2) *ἐχ Χαρράν* Gen. xxix. 4 A, *ἐχ χειμάρρου* Lev. xxiii. 40 A. Other examples of irregular *χ* are *εἴχοσι* 3 K. ix. 11 A, *λιχμωμένους* W. xi. 18 A (not from *λιχμᾶν* 'to lick,' cf. *λικμηθέντες v.* 20: but the exact meaning of the passage is doubtful), *ψεχάδων* Cant. v. 2 ℵ, *χαλλίπαις* 4 M. xvi. 10 A*vid.

10. X>Γ. This change is unrepresented in the Ptolemaic papyri: in the LXX it appears, mainly in late MSS, in two pairs of words: (1) *δραγμή* in V (2 M. iv. 19, x. 20, xii. 43: 3 M. iii. 28: in the last passage A has *δραγχμάς*) and *δίδραγμον* in F (N. iii. 47: Jos. vii. 21) and once in A (2 Es. xx. 32): (2) in ℵ *αἰγμάλωτος* Na. iii. 10, *αἰγμαλωσία* Jer. xxv. 19: this MS usually has *ἐκμάλωτος* etc. (see above).

11. **The dentals.** The interchange of *τ*, *δ*, *θ* is characteristic of Egyptian Greek, probably on account of the difficulty which natives of the country found in distinguishing between the sounds represented by these letters[3]. In the circumstances the examples in the LXX uncials are fewer than might be expected.

12. T and Δ. The only examples noted of interchange (common in papyri, mainly illiterate, from ii/B.C.) are (1) *πάνδες* 4 K. xxiv. 16 B*, *αὐδῷ*=*αὐτῷ* 1 Es. iii. 5 B*, *κασσιδέριον* Zech. iv. 10 ℵ* (so *κασιδέρινα* BU 1036, 15, 108 A.D.): (2) *δεκατάρχους*[4]

[1] So in an Attic Inscription of iv/B.C. and in papyri, mostly post-Ptolemaic: the Ptolemaic documents usually have *χιτών* (or the Ionic *κιθών*), Mayser 41, 184.

[2] Meisterhans 106, Mayser 228.

[3] Thumb *Hell.* 134.

[4] Due, perhaps, to the analogy of *δεκατός*.

1 M. iii. 55 ℵ* (so in papyri of iii B.C., PP ii. 13 (1) and 4 (1) and (2), not quoted by Mayser: *δεκάδαρχος* is read by BAF in the three Pentateuch passages).

13. T and Θ. Uncertainty as to whether the aspirated letter should be used or not is specially evident in words containing two aspirated letters or one aspirated and one tenuis. *Ἀναφάλαντος -φαλάντωμα* is read by the uncials in L. xiii. 41 ff.: the papyri of iii B.C. fluctuate between this and *ἀναφάλανθος*, which is probably the older form (Mayser 177 f.). *Κολόκυνθα* has the best authority in Jon. iv. 6, 7, 9, 10: *κολόκυντα* is read by A (Q): *κολοκύντη* is the Attic form according to Phrynichus (Rutherford *NP* 498): similar fluctuation in the papyri.

(i) Further examples of insertion of aspirate. *Κάλλυνθρον* is certain in L. xxiii. 40 (BAF), and probably *φόβηθρον* should be read in Is. xix. 17 with B* (*φόβητρον* cett.) as in Luke xxi. 11 (WH with BD). The following are due to attraction of a second aspirated letter: *καθόπισθεν* Zech. vi. 6 B*ℵ*, *βαθράχους* Ex. viii. 9 F. *Μασθός* for *μαστός* is read by A in Is. xxxii. 12, Lam. ii. 20, by Q in Ez. xvi. 4 (the reverse, *στ* for *σθ*, is frequent in Ptolemaic papyri, Mayser 179). (ii) Examples of omission. The 2nd pers. of the 2 aor. imperat. pass. has its termination in *-τι* (for *-θι*), like the 1 aor. imperat. pass.: *ἐντράπητι* Sir. iv. 25 B*AC (*-ηθι* ℵB^{b}), *χάρητι* Tob. xiii. 13 B*A. Assimilation to preceding *τ* may account for *κατορτώθη* 2 Ch. xxix. 35 B*, *ἐνταῦτα* 4 K. ii. 2 A, 2 M. xiii. 6 V. *Νεχωτά* Is. xxxix. 2 ℵ* (transliteration of נכתה: *νεχωθά* cett.).

14. Δ and Θ. Under this head come the forms *οὐθείς*, *μηθείς*, which have already been considered in the Introduction (§ 5, p. 58 ff.). They are not peculiar to Egypt: for some centuries they enjoyed a wide currency in the *κοινή* and then disappeared again in the first two centuries of our era. That they are not due to mixture of *οὔτε* and *οὐδέ* is shown by the fact that the fem. *οὐδεμία* remains unaltered. Their explanation lies in a coalescence of *δ* with the aspirate of *εἷς* to form *θ* (= *δ* + *h*)[1].

15. There is a curious distinction between the late derivatives from *οὐθείς*, *οὐδείς*. Each form had a progeny of its own. These derivatives are apparently unattested outside Biblical

[1] See Meisterhans 104, Mayser 180 ff., Schweizer 112 ff.

and ecclesiastical Greek[1] and are unrepresented in certain portions of the LXX, e.g. the Pentateuch, Isaiah and Job (excluding Θ)[2]. *Οὐθείς* produced (*1*) *ἐξουθενέω* (*-ημα*), while *οὐδείς* produced (*2*) *ἐξουδενόω* (*-ωμα -ωσις*). Two rarer and doubtful forms, due to mixture, are (*3*) *ἐξουδενεῖν*, (*4*) *ἐξουθενοῦν*. (*1*) must have been coined while *οὐθείς* was still in vogue, probably in the earlier part of ii B.C.: it is preferred by literary writers, including the translator of Proverbs (though he wrote *οὐδείς*): it is the form used by Luke and Paul in N.T. (*2*) apparently came later, when *οὐδείς* had begun to reassert itself: it is the form used in the later LXX books. 1 Kingdoms uses both (*1*) and (*2*), in juxtaposition in viii. 7 B *οὐ σὲ ἐξουθενήκασιν, ἀλλ' ἢ ἐμὲ ἐξουδενώκασιν*. In Sirach (the Greek of which was written during the period of transition from *οὐθείς* to *οὐδείς*) all four forms are attested.

The evidence for the verbs is as follows:

(*1*) *Ἐξουθενεῖν* 1 K. ii. 30, viii. 7 (7 A), x. 19 B: Prov. i. 7: Wis. iii. 11, iv. 18: Sir. xix. 1, xxxiv. 31 B: Am. vi. 1: Jer. vi. 14: Dan. O iv. 28: 2 M. i. 27, and occasionally as a v.l. elsewhere.

(*2*) *Ἐξουδενοῦν* Jd. ix. 38 B: 1 K. viii. 7 B, x. 19 A, xv. 9, 23 *bis*, 26 *bis*, xvi. 1, 7: 2 K. vi. 16, xii. 10: 4 K. xix. 21 A: 1 Ch. xv. 29: 2 Ch. xxxvi. 16 B: Jdth xiii. 17: Ψ 18 times: Job Θ xxx. 1 BC: Eccl. ix. 16: Cant. viii. 1 B**ℵ**, 7 B: Sir. xxxiv. 22 **ℵ**AC, 31 **ℵ**, xlvii. 7: Zech. iv. 10: Mal. four times: Dan. Θ xi. 21: 1 M. iii. 14 **ℵ**A.

(*3*) *Ἐξουδενεῖν* 4 K. xix. 21 B: Ez. xxi. 10, xxii. 8 BQ: Sir. xxxiv. 22 B: Cant. viii. 1 A, 7 A.

(*4*) *Ἐξουθενοῦν* is read by B in Ψ xliii. 6, l. 19, by A in Sir. xxxiv. 31, by **ℵ** in Jdth xiii. 17.

16. **The labials.** Π > B. *Ἀμβλάκημα, ἀμβλακία* (cf. Doric *ἀμβλακεῖν*)[3] are the forms attested by the uncials in the only passages where the words occur, Dan. Θ vi. 4, 3 M. ii. 19.

[1] Plutarch has *ἐξουδενίζω*, and *ἐξουθενίζω* is cited by LS from a Scholiast on Aristophanes.

[2] These books use other verbs to render מאס, בזה e.g. *ἀπειθεῖν, ἀφιστάναι, ὑπεριδεῖν, φαυλίζειν, ἀπαναίνεσθαι, ἀπειπεῖν, ἀποποιεῖσθαι, ἀπαρνεῖσθαι* etc.

[3] And cf. the fluctuation between *Ἀμπρακία Ἀμβρακία* in Attic inscriptions of iv/B.C., Meisterhans 77.

B > Π. ℵ has *πορρᾶ* (=*βορρᾶ*) Jer. i. 14, A *προπληταις* (=*προβλῆτες*) 4 M. xiii. 6.

17. Φ > Π. ℵ has *σπόνδυλος ἐκσπονδυλίζειν* in 4 M. x. 8, xi. 18 (Ionic and in some *κοινή* writers, e.g. Strabo: Crönert 85): A keeps the Attic form with *σφ*, and so all the uncials in Lev. v. 8. (*Σπόγγος, σπυρίς*, which show similar fluctuation, are absent from LXX.) *Ἰωσήφ* in Hellenized form appears in the uncials as *Ἰώσηφος* and *Ἰώσηπος*: the latter form has Ptolemaic support and was invariably used by the historian Josephus of himself and of the patriarch.

18. Π—Φ. *Σκνίψ* has cases *σκνῖφα σκνῖφες* in Ex. viii. 16 ff. in BA(F) (with variants *σκνίκες* and *κνῖφες* F, *σνίφαν* A), and the same forms appear as variants in Ψ civ. 31, W. xix. 10, where the B text has the more regular *σκν(ε)ῖπες, σκν(ε)ῖπα*. The two forms go back to iii/B.C. (*ὑπόσκνιπος, ὑπόσκνιφος*, Mayser 174).

In the case of *φάτνη*[1], *φατνοῦν, φάτνωμα* (which have preponderant authority) individual MSS exhibit a variety of spellings with transposition or loss of aspirate, transposition of the first two consonants, and substitution of *μ* for *ν*: (1) *πάθνη* Jl. i. 17 ℵ. (2) *πάθμη* Job vi. 5 ℵ, xxxix. 9 ℵ. (3) *ἐτάφνωσεν* 3 K. vii. 40 A. (4) *πεφατμωμένα* Ez. xli. 15 B, *φατμώματα* Am. viii. 3 B, Zeph. ii. 14 B. (5) *πατμώματα* Cant. i. 17 ℵ.

19. B and M. The labial and nasal are occasionally interchanged, mainly when flanked by vowels and in the neighbourhood of a liquid or another nasal. (1) Alteration of *β* to *μ* is seen in the reading of A *ἐφ' ἡμῶν* in 2 M. iv. 12, a corruption of *ἐφήβων* which V reads (cf. *v.* 9 *ἐφηβίαν*): also in *Σαναμάσσαρος* 1 Es. ii. 11 BA* (=Sheshbazzar), *εὐσέμιαν* (=*εὐσέβειαν*) 4 M. xv. 3 ℵ. Assimilation causes *μόλιμος* (=*μόλιβος, μόλυβδος*) in Jer. vi. 29 B, *βόλιβον* in Sir. xxii. 14 A[2]. (2) The converse change is more frequent[3]. *Τέρμινθος*, apparently the oldest form for the turpentine tree (in LXX thus only in Gen. xiv. 6 E, xliii. 11 F), develops into *τερέμινθος* (B 5 out of 7 times, A 2/7), and thence to *τερέβινθος* read by all the uncials

[1] Thumb (*Hell.* 71) conjectures that *πάθνη* is an Ionism taken over by the *κοινή*. This is the form which has survived in modern Greek *παχνί* (=*παθνίον*) with Asiatic varieties *παθενίν πανθίν παθιμίν* (ib. 81). LS suggest derivation from √ΠΑΤ (*πατέομαι*).

[2] LS quote *περιβολιβῶσαι* from a Rhodian Inscription.

[3] Attic Inscriptions show *βαρνάμενοι* (=*μαρν.*) and fluctuation in *Σερμυλία* (*Σερβ.*), *Ἀδραμυτηνός* (*Ἀδραβ.*), Meist. 77. *Ῥύβην*=*ῥύμην* is the only Ptolemaic example cited by Mayser 199. *Γερβανικόν* is attested in Rhodes and Asia Minor, Nachmanson 82. The proximity of *ρ* in all these examples is noticeable.

in Isaiah (i. 30, vi. 13), and four times elsewhere (by E, A, ℵA). In the case of στῖμι, a pigment for the eyelids, and στιμ(μ)ίζειν, the forms with β receive slightly better support (cf. Lat. *stibium*): στίβι Jer. iv. 30 Bℵ (στίμμη A, στεῖμι Q), ἐστιβίζου Ez. xxiii. 40 BAQ, but ἐστιμίσατο 4 K. ix. 30 B* (β in AB^{ab}). Ἀνὰ βέσον 1 K. vii. 12 A, οἰκουβένην Is. xiv. 26 ℵ, βέλη (=μέλη) 4 M. x. 20 ℵ.

Π is converted to μ in μοιμαινες (=ποιμένες) Jer. x. 21 A.

20. **The liquids.** In the vulgar language from the Hellenistic period down to modern Greek (which has e.g. ἀδερφός ἤρθα ἐρπίδα) ρ replaces λ, especially before consonants: instances occur, also, of the reverse change in the κοινή where no consonant follows[1]. Two examples of the interchange appear to have become stereotyped: σικυήλατον "a cucumber-bed" (from ἐλαύνω = "plant") becomes σικυήρατον (so in the only LXX passages, Is. i. 8, Ep. Jer. 69 with variants with υ in the first syllable): conversely κρίβανος (the Attic form according to Phrynichus), a small covered cooking-vessel, always appears as κλίβανος in LXX (as previously in Ionic, Hdt. II. 92). The papyri support the LXX in these two instances (Mayser 188). In the following passages the interchange affects the meaning. In 1 Macc. the word φάλαγξ which should certainly be read in all five passages, in four of them has a v. l. φάραγξ in one or other of the uncials (vi. 35 A, where Swete retains φάρ., 38 V, 45 A, x. 82 ℵ* (V)). In the same book (1 M. ix. 42) the reading of ℵ εἰς τὸ ἕλος τοῦ Ἰορδάνου (cf. *v.* 45) must be preferred to εἰς τὸ ὄρος of AV: the vulgar pronunciation and the influence of ὄρος in *vv.* 38 and 40 have produced орос out of елос. In Sir. xxii. 18 the converse change has occurred: it is the χάρακες (Bℵ) or "pales set on a high place" that cannot stand against the wind, not the χάλικες (AC), "pebbles" or "rubble."

The MSS yield the following further examples: (1) Λ > Ρ: οἰνοφρυγεῖ Dt. xxi. 20 B, βερτίων Is. xvii. 3 ℵ*, ἀργηρά Jer. x. 19 ℵ*, ἔθρασεν Job xx. 19 A (= ἔθλασεν cett.), χαρβάνη Sir. xxiv. 15 A

[1] Mr W. E. Crum tells me that in several Sahidic sub-dialects the two consonants are confused.

and *χαβράνη* Ex. xxx. 34 A (for *χαλβάνη* = חלבנה), *Ἀμερσάρ* Dan. Θ i. 11 and 16 A (= המלצר): (2) P > Λ: *φαλέτρας* Jer. xxviii. 11 B*, *ἑσπέλας* Is. xxi. 13 א*, *κλιμάτων* Ψ cxviii. 102 א*, *Καλχαμύς* 1 Es. i. 23 A (= ברכמיש), *φλουράν* 1 M. xi. 66 A.

21. **The spirants σ ζ.** Z, which in classical times was probably pronounced like *zd*, in the Hellenistic period had the weaker sound of voiced *s* (as in 'those'), as is shown by the substitution of *ζ* (or *σζ*) for *σ*, especially before *β* and *μ*[1]. א has *ζμύρνα* five times (Cant. iii. 6, iv. 6, 14, v. 13, Sir. xxiv. 15) and once *ζσμαράγδου* Sir. xxxv. 6: elsewhere all the uncials have *σμύρνα*, *σμάραγδος*. The same change appears in the form *ζιβύνη*, "a spear," attested by all the uncials in Is. ii. 4, Jer. vi. 23 (also Mic. iv. 3 AQ*, where it is a gloss from the Isaiah passage): Judith alone keeps *σιβύνη*, i. 15 B*א* (altered to *ζιβ.* in A and correctors of B and א): this foreign word of doubtful extraction appears outside the LXX in a variety of forms, *συβίνη*, *σιγύνη* etc., but it is clear that the older form had initial *σ*[2].

Attic *ξύν* for *σύν* survived after 400 B.C. only as a literary affectation and is unrepresented in LXX[3]. א writes *ὡσμῖλας* for *ὡς σμῖλαξ* Na. i. 10.

22. **Insertion of Consonants.** A remarkable feature of the *κοινή* (or rather, excepting one instance, of local varieties of the *κοινή*) is the tendency to insert the nasal *μ* before a labial (*β* or *π*), especially when the labial is followed by another consonant, usually *σ*: in other words *μψ* replaces *ψ*.

23. One instance is distinguished from the rest by its greater frequency: it also appears to owe its origin, in part at least, to another cause. The use of *λήμψομαι* (for *λήψομαι*) together with cognate forms *ἐλήμφθην*, (*ἀνά*)*λημψις*, (*ἀνα*)-*λημπτέος* etc. became for a considerable period universal. The papyri and the later uncials enable us to distinguish three periods. (1) In the Ptolemaic age, from iii/ to i/B.C., both the classical *λήψομαι* and the newly-introduced *λήμψομαι* were

[1] Meisterhans 88 (Attic examples from 329 B.C.), Mayser 204, 209: the latter's suggestion that *σζ* in *ἀνασζητήσας* etc. is intended to mark off the syllables more clearly will not suit initial *σζ* in the above instance.

[2] Sturz *de dialecto Macedonica* 46 f.

[3] *ξυνωρίδος*, written by a seventh century corrector of א in Is. xxi. 9, is the only trace.

employed, the former slightly preponderating[1]. (2) Under the Empire, from i/A.D. until after iv/A.D., λήμψομαι and its kin are uncontested, having driven the classical forms off the field[2]. (3) The reappearance of the latter in the uncials of the Byzantine epoch and in the correctors' revisions of the older uncials suggests that the μ forms again went out of use between vi/ and viii/A.D.[3]

Now the orthography attested in the three oldest LXX uncials is that of the second period, that is to say, the classical forms are practically absent. If, as is suggested by the Ptolemaic papyri, the autographs contained both λήμψομαι and λήψομαι, scribes of the Roman period have produced uniformity by writing the former throughout.

There are some 450 examples (including the compounds) where the μ forms occur in all three of the main uncials or in one or two of them. On the other hand, examples of forms like λήψομαι in the original script of B, ℵ and A do not amount to a dozen in all : B has 3, one doubtful (Mic. vi. 16, Is. ii. 4^{vid}, Jer. xxxi. 7), ℵ has 3, one doubtful (Zech. xi. 7, Is. x. 29^{fort}, Jer. xli. 3), A 5 (Jd. vii. 5 λήψῃ [read λάψῃ and contrast λήμψῃ ib.], 1 K. xxv. 11, Jer. xli. 3, Ez. xlv. 18, Sir. iii. 24 : in 2 M. v. 20 *καταληφθείς* is probably a case of itacism = -λιφθείς)[4]. The classical forms become more frequent in later MSS and corrections of MSS[5], occurring sporadically in C (v/A.D.), T (vii/A.D.) and Γ (viii/ix/A.D.), constantly in Q* (vi/A.D.) in Min. Proph. and Isaiah (in Jer., except xxxi. 1, 41, and in Ez. they are due to correctors), always in Cod. 87 of Daniel (ix/A.D.), and nearly always in V (viii/ix/) and B^b (probably xiv/A.D.).

[1] Mayser 194 f.

[2] Crönert 66 asserts "nullum reperiri in Berolinensium corpore exemplum nasali carens." The huge Berlin collection consists mainly of papyri from i/ to iv/A.D.: I have noted one example wanting the nasal, BU 1060. 30 *προσδιαληφθέντος* (14 B.C.): J. H. Moulton (*CR* xv. 34) adds one instance of ii/A.D. where the μ has been afterwards written above the line. The only other examples dated A.D. which I have noted are BM ii. 276. 4 *προσειλ]ῆφθαι* (15 A.D.), OP iv. 724. 8 f. λήψομαι, λήψῃ (155 A.D.). Συνλήβδην FP 21. 7 (134 A.D.) is differentiated by the δ following the labial.

[3] So Crönert 67, who fixes the date of their disappearance from the living language at about the end of viii/A.D.

[4] F (iv/v/A.D.) has none (always λήμψομαι etc.).

[5] Cf. Gregory *Prol.* 72 for a similar distinction in the MSS of the N.T.

24. Apart from these forms from λαμβάνειν the LXX contains only four instances of words showing insertion of μ before ψ, all in Cod. A, viz. λάμψασιν (for λάψασιν) Jd. vii. 7, καμψάκης "a flask," 3 K xvii. 12, xix. 6 (from κάπτω, cf. Lat. *capsa*: elsewhere A unites with B (א) in writing καψ.), ἀντάμιμψιν (= ἀντάμειψιν) Ψ cxviii. 112, ἀνακύμψαι Job x. 15.

25. The origin of this inserted nasal has not yet been finally decided: Thumb (*Hell.* 136) thinks it unnecessary to assume a uniform explanation for all the instances. Λήμψομαι may be a mixture or compromise between Attic λήψομαι and Ionic λάμψομαι[1] (which retained both the α and μ of the present stem) or it may be an independent formation due to the same phonetic law which produced the other nasalised κοινή forms. These other forms (συμψέλιον etc.) are specially characteristic of parts of Asia Minor (Καμπαδοκία, Παμφλαγόνες are attested) and Dieterich (*Untersuch.* 92 ff.) traces their origin to that region. Egypt, however, yields examples other than λήμψομαι, and Thumb (*op. cit.*) suspects the influence of Egyptian pronunciation: the four examples in the preceding section which are peculiar to A may be taken as supporting the Egyptian origin of that MS.

It should be added that the older Attic, like the LXX, shows fluctuation in the use of the nasal in πί(μ)πλημι, πί(μ)πρημι, and in some proper names (Τλη(μ)πόλεμος etc., Meist. 84).

26. The combination μψ recurs in another instance, where the *p*, not the *m*, is the intruder, viz. in the name Σαμψών (= שמשׁן), which is always so written in Judges (B and A texts)[2].

[1] The Ionic form occurs once in a papyrus of c. 250 B.C. παραλάμψεσθαι (Mayser 195), in the LXX in Job Θ xxvii. 21 C ἀναλάμψεται δὲ αὐτὸν καύσων. It is noticeable that the Hellenistic -λιμπάνω for -λείπω (§ 19, 3) appears to be of Ionic origin (Hippocrates).

[2] Schmiedel (W.-S. 64) compares Lat. *sumo sumpsi*.

27. As euphony requires the insertion of π between μ and σ, so between μ and ρ there is a tendency to insert another labial, β (cf. $\mu\epsilon\sigma\eta\mu\beta\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha = \mu\epsilon\sigma\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$). $\Mu\alpha\mu\beta\rho\acute{\eta}$ (ממרא) is written by the uncials in Genesis, $\Zeta\alpha\mu\beta\rho(\epsilon)\acute{\iota}$ renders both זמרי and עמרי: in other names there is fluctuation, as between $'\Alpha\mu\beta\rho\acute{\alpha}\mu$ (-$\acute{\alpha}\nu$) and $'\Alpha\mu\rho\acute{\alpha}\mu$ (עמרם)[1].

Ezra (עזרא) in LXX becomes $\text{Ἔ}\sigma\rho\alpha\varsigma$ ($'\Epsilon\sigma\rho\acute{\alpha}$) in B, $\text{Ἔ}\zeta\rho\alpha\varsigma$ ($'\Epsilon\zeta\rho\acute{\alpha}$) in A, $\text{Ἔ}\sigma\delta\rho\alpha\varsigma$ ($'\Epsilon\sigma\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}$) in א[2]. Probably the δ in the last form, familiarised by its adoption in our Apocrypha, is euphonic, like the β in $\Mu\alpha\mu\beta\rho\acute{\eta}$: but it is conceivable that $\sigma\delta$ is used to represent Heb. ז[3] with a reminiscence of the old pronunciation of ζ (*zd*), see 21 above.

א inserts a nasal before δ in Jl. i. 6 $\check{o}\nu\delta o\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma = \check{o}\delta.$, Ψ cxxxix. 2 $\grave{\alpha}\nu\delta\acute{\iota}\kappa o\upsilon = \check{\alpha}\delta.$

28. **Omission of Consonants.** Under this head we have to deal with the omission of consonants, γ in particular, (1) between vowels, (2) in other positions, and we are brought into contact with some peculiarities of Greek as pronounced by Egyptians.

29. The curious phenomenon of the omission of *intervocalic* γ suggests that the guttural, in this position at least, was pronounced as a spirant, with the sound of *y* or (*g*)*h*[4].

[1] The nasal and liquid are sometimes separated by α: N. xxvi. 20 B $\Sigma\alpha\mu\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\mu$ $\Sigma\alpha\mu\alpha\rho\alpha\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}$, 1 Ch. xxvii. 18 A $'\Alpha\mu\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}$.

[2] $\text{Ἔ}\sigma\delta\rho\alpha\varsigma$ in B in the subscriptions to 1 and 2 Esdras, which are therefore later than the books themselves: also once in the body of the work, 1 Es. viii. 19.

[3] Cf. $'\Epsilon\sigma\delta\rho(\epsilon)\acute{\iota}$ BA, $'\Epsilon\sigma\delta\rho\epsilon\iota\kappa\acute{\alpha}\nu$ 1 Ch. ix. 44 B, $'\Epsilon\sigma\delta\rho\iota\acute{\eta}\lambda$ BאQ, $'\Epsilon\sigma\delta\rho(\alpha)\eta\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu$ BאA (=יזרעאל Jezreel), in all of which $\sigma\delta$ corresponds to ז. On the other hand in 4 K. xix. 37 it answers to ם: $'\Epsilon\sigma\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\chi$ B=$'\Epsilon\sigma\theta\rho\acute{\alpha}\chi$ A=MT נסרך.

[4] As in modern Greek: Thumb *Handbuch* 1. Conversely in the papyri (Mayser 167 f.) it is occasionally *inserted* between vowels, seemingly to avoid hiatus: $\acute{\upsilon}\gamma\iota(\gamma)\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$, $\kappa\lambda\acute{\alpha}(\gamma)\omega = \kappa\lambda\alpha\acute{\iota}\omega$, $\grave{\alpha}\rho\chi\iota(\gamma)\epsilon\rho\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ etc. In papyri of iii/ and ii/B.C. an ι is interpolated for the same purpose between the vowels o and η: $\beta o(\iota)\eta\theta\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$, $\grave{o}\gamma\delta o(\iota)\acute{\eta}\kappa o\nu\tau\alpha$ (Mayser 110).

In the case of one word, ὀλί(γ)ος, the omission of γ in writing began c. 300 B.C. and spread over a wide area in the Greek-speaking world[1]. Apart from this and one or two other words the usage was apparently restricted to Egypt[2].

The uncials B, ℵ and A always write ὀλίγος, but in two derivatives—ὀλιγοῦν (a Hellenistic creation, perhaps coined by the translators)[3] and ὀλιγοστός—the γ is omitted, four times in all, by the original scribe of B: Jd. x. 16 ὠλιώθη, 4 K. iv. 3 ὀλιώσῃς, 2 Es. xix. 32 ὀλιωθήτω ("B*vid"), Is. xli. 14 ὀλιοστός[4].

Ἀγ(ε)ίοχα[5] (so constantly in the uncials, see § 16, 7: ἀγήοχα usually in Hellenistic writers), the perfect of ἄγω (condemned by Phrynichus, who prescribes ἦχα), is probably another instance of omission of "spirantic" γ[6]; ἀγήγοχα appears in Inscriptions.

30. The omission of intervocalic γ in other instances, usually between ευ, αυ and a long vowel, appears to be a peculiarity of Egypt during the Roman period: it is unknown to the Ptolemaic papyri. In the LXX it is almost confined to one section of ℵ (Prophets: once in Proverbs), and the

[1] Meisterhans 75 (Attic Inscr. show ὀλίος ὀλιαρχία ὀλιωρέω: also Φιαλεύς = Φιγ.): Mayser 163 f.: Schweizer 108 (who mentions as places, other than Egypt, where ὀλίος is found Boeotia, Arcadia, Tarentum, the Tauric Chersonese, Imbros, Pamphylia and the extreme East of the Empire).

[2] Thumb, *Hell.* 134 f., distinguishes two groups: (1) the older forms attested outside Egypt viz. ὀλίος Φιάλευς (to which should be added Boeot. ἰών = ἐγώ and perhaps ἀγήοχα pf. of ἄγω), (2) the 'Egyptian' forms φεύω = φεύγω etc. In the latter he traces the native's difficulty in pronouncing γ, which in other instances produced in Egyptian Greek the alteration of γ to κ (see § 7, 2 ff. above). In the earlier group it is curious to note that (adopting the LXX form ἀγίοχα) the lost γ was in each case preceded by ι.

[3] The verb is confined in LXX to a late group of books.

[4] As against these four passages there are eight and 18 respectively where ὀλιγοῦν ὀλιγοστός are written by all the uncials. Aquila is cited as writing ὠλιώθησαν in Jer. xiv. 2.

[5] The papyri have (as Dr J. H. Moulton informs me) ἀγήγοχα HP 34 (iii/B.C.), ἀγείοχα Teb. 19 (ii/B.C.), ἀγέοχα Teb. 124 (ii/B.C.) and ἀγέωχα (ii/—i/B.C.).

[6] The omission has been otherwise explained as due to dissimilation.

Prophetical portion of that MS or of a parent MS was therefore, presumably, written by an Egyptian scribe.

The examples are as follows :—

Φεύειν in ℵ occurs in Is. x. 18, xiii. 14, xvi. 3, xxii. 3, xxxi. 9, xliii. 14, Jer. xxvii. 28, xxxi. 44, xlv. 19, Jon. i. 3 (φοιῖν=φυ[γε]ῖν), Na. ii. 9 (φθυῦ|τες sic), Prov. xii. 13 (ἐκφεύει). In all cases, except Jer. xlv. 19 πεφευότων, the lost γ is followed by a long vowel. The γ is written where a short vowel follows (φεύγετε -έτω Jer. iv. 6, xxvi. 6, xxviii. 6, xxx. 8, xxxi. 6), less frequently before a long vowel. B and A have no examples of loss of γ in this word.

Κρανή for κραυγή is consistently written by the first hand of ℵ in the Prophetical books, 17 times including Jer. xxxii. 22 καυῆς: the only exceptions (all in 'Jer. *a*') are Jer. iv. 19 where the MS has κραγήν and viii. 19, xviii. 22, xx. 16 where it has the usual form. On the other hand κραυγή is always written by this MS in the historical and literary books (14 examples between 2 Es. and Judith). B writes κρανή in Is. xxx. 19 (with ℵ) and Ez. xxi. 22.

Ζεύη for ζεύγη Is. v. 10 ℵ*.

Ἐξερευόμενα for -ερευγ. is written by A in Ψ cxliii. 13, and the same MS in W. xix. 10 has the aorist ἐξηρεύσατο formed as from ἐξερεύεσθαι. (ℵ keeps γ in this word, which however is not found in the Prophetical portion.)

(Ἀνεείγνωσκον Job xxxi. 36 A, cf. 32 below.)

Ἀνοίει for ἀνοίγει Is. l. 5 ℵ*.

Λεῖ for λέγει Zech. ii. 8 ℵ* (cf. mod. Greek λέει).

The weak pronunciation of intervocalic γ occasionally produces its *insertion* in the wrong place[1]. ℵ writes λέγοντες for λέοντες Jer. ii. 15 : hence too the mistaken reading attested by BℵA in Est. vii. 3 ὁ λόγος μου for ὁ λαός μου (עמי).

31. While γ is the consonant most frequently omitted between vowels, there are certain others which are liable to omission in a similar position. These are κ (χ), τ, δ, λ, σ (ρ, ν). Most of the instances occur again in the Prophetical portion of Cod. ℵ and doubtless reproduce the Egyptian pronunciation. As a contribution to the study of Graeco-Egyptian phonetics and as bearing on the history of the uncials, it may be useful to collect them here.

[1] Cf. papyri examples in note 4 on p. 111.

Examples of omission of intervocalic consonants other than γ.

κ. ℵ has πρωτότοα (= -τοκα) Ψ cxxxiv. 8. Cf. (? from haplology) διαθης = διαθήκης Zech. ix. 11, διος (=δίκαιος) 2 Es. xix. 33.

χ. B has ἀπέεσθε (= ἀπέχ.) Mal. iii. 7. Cf. the variants ψυχαί ψύαι ψύαι in Ψ xxxvii. 8, and ἐξεαν=ἐξέχεαν Dt. xxi. 7 F.

τ. ℵ has ἀποστατε (= ἀποστάται) Is. xxx. 1, σῖος (= σῖτος) Hg. i. 11, καάλοιποι (=κατ.) Zech. xiv. 2, συνεελέσθησαν (= -ετελ.) Job i. 5. B has a parallel to the last in ἀποελεσθῆναι 1 Es. v. 70: cf. Is. ii. 13 μεώρων B=μετεώρων. A has τοῦο (=τοῦτο) Ex. ix. 5.

δ. ℵ has παῖ|α (= παῖδα) Is. xxvi. 16, ῦωρ xlviii. 21, Ἰουμέᾳ (=Ἰδουμαίᾳ) Jer. xxix. 8. A likewise has Ἰουμαίας Lam. iv. 21. (Conversely, as γ is inserted in ὑγιγαίνω etc. of the papyri, so is δ in πραδέων=πραέων Is. xxvi. 6 ℵ.)

λ. ℵ has μέεσιν=μέλεσιν Job ix. 28, θά|ασσαν Jer. xxviii. 36, βασιέως xxxiv. 9, cf. βασια=βασιλέα Jon. iii. 6. Similarly A has βασι|ως=-σιλέως 2 K. xv. 3 and καταβάω=-βάλω Ez. xxix. 5: V has ἀντιπάους=-πάλους 3 M. i. 5: B πουπειρία (=πολυπ.) Sir. xxv. 6.

σ. ℵ has ἐποίηε=-ησε Is. xii. 5 (cf. ποιηες=ποιῆσαι Jer. vi. 25 BℵA), κιθάριον=-ισον xxiii. 16, κρίιν=κρίσιν xlii. 3, πληίον (=πλησ.) Jer. xxii. 13, ὀλιγώεις (=-ώσεις) Hb. iii. 12. B has ἐπιλεύεσθαι=ἐπελεύσεσθαι 1 Es. iv. 49 (in the same section which has the omission of τ noted above) and κριν=κρίσιν Is. i. 17. A has θραύ=θρασύ N. xiii. 29, σύνεις=σύνεσις Is. xlvii. 10 (cf. συνε|εις Ψ xxxi. 9 U).

ρ. A has μιεός for μιερός 2 M. iv. 19.

μ and ν. ℵ has μεγαρηονήσης (=-μεγαλορημ.) Ob. 12, ἐσφραγισμέου Is. xxix. 11.

32. Of omission of a consonant *in another position than between vowels* there are two examples which were universally adopted. The second γ in γίγνομαι, γιγνώσκω ceased to be written after c. 300 B.C.[1]: vulgar Attic, as attested by vase inscriptions, had led the way[2]. Γ(ε)ίνομαι γ(ε)ινώσκω are all but universal in the LXX uncials as in the papyri. The classical spelling was revived by some of the Atticists.

Γίγνομαι in the leading uncials is confined to the A text of 1 and 2 Esdras, Job xl. 27 A, and to a unique example in B (1 Es. vi. 33). A has it five times in 1 Esdras (from v. 43

[1] Meisterhans 75, Mayser 164 f. The latter compares (*g*)*natus*, (*g*)*nosco*, and assumes an intermediate stage when -γν- was written -νν-.

[2] Thumb *Hell.* 207.

παραγίγν. to viii. 90 ἠγνέσθω *sic*, clearly a corruption of ΓΙ to Η: in i. 30, iv. 16, vi. 33. vii. 3 γιν.) and nine times in 2 Esdras (ἐγιν. only in xv. 18 with γιγν. ib.). It appears that among the ancestors of A was a small volume comprising 1 and 2 Esdras, written by an Atticizing scribe probably after ii/A.D.

Γιγνώσκω appears sporadically as a v.l. of B, ℵ, A in a wider circle of books: 1 Ch. xxviii. 9 B: 1 Es. ix. 41 A: Est. iv. 11 A, c 5 A, vi. 1 A: Job? xxxi. 36 A (ΑΝΕΕΙΓ. for ΑΝΕΓΙΓ. cf. 30 above), xxxvi. 5 Bℵ: Tob. v. 14 A, vii. 4 A *bis*: Jer. xliii. 13 A: Dan. Θ i. 4 B: 1 M. v. 14 ℵ.

33. Other examples of omission by the original scribes of the uncials of consonants in positions other than intervocalic have their interest in the history of phonetics. They are not to be treated as mere blunders. Here, as in the cases of omission of intervocalic consonants, ℵ again affords the majority of the instances, but there are not a few in the other MSS, and we cannot be so confident in all cases as to their "Egyptian" origin. The omitted consonants are partly the same as in the former case, partly different: omission of ρ, which does not occur between vowels, is specially common here.

Omission of gutturals.

γ. The γ in the nom. of nouns ending in -γξ gen. -γγος is sometimes dropped, on the analogy, it would seem, of e.g. μάστιξ -ιγος. Φάραξ is written by ℵ in (Zech. xiv. 5 πάραξ), Is. lvii. 5, Jer. vii. 32, by Q in Is. lxv. 10, λάρυξ by C in Job Θ xxxiv. 3. (Conversely μάστιγξ appears in 3 K. xii. 24r B: 2 Ch. x. 11 B, 14 B: Sir. xxiii. 11 ℵ.) Similar omission before ξ (κ) is seen in ἑλέξει Is. xi. 3 ℵ, ἀνεξέλεκτος Prov. x. 17 B.

Elsewhere omission takes place in the proximity of ρ or a nasal. In ℵ: ὀ*ρ*[γ]ῆς[1] Jer. xxvii. 13, κρεά[γ]ρας lii. 18, κατανένυ[γ]μαι Is. vi. 5, δή[γ]ματα W. xvi. 9, ἔ[γ]νω Zeph. iii. 5. In A: τελεσιουρ[γ]εῖ Prov. xix. 4.

κ. In ℵ: ἔ[κ]στασις Zech. xiv. 13, ἐ[κ]φεύξεσθαι Est. E 4. In B: δι*ε*[κ]βολῇ Ez. xlvii. 11, ἐκλε[κ]τοί 1 Ch. vii. 40: cf. πρωτοτο[κο]ν[2] Ex. xi. 5, ἀ[κα]θαρτος Lev. xv. 11. In A: σ[κ]νῖφαν Ex. viii. 18, cf. κατα[κα]λύπτον Lev. iv. 8. In F cf. συμβολο[κο]πῶν Dt. xxi. 20.

[1] The omitted consonant is inserted in square brackets throughout this section.

[2] This and some of the following examples may be merely cases of haplology.

χ. In ℵ: *ἐτέ[χ]θησαν* 1 Ch. xiv. 3. In C cf. *ψυ[χη]σου* Sir. xxx. 39.

34. *Omission of dentals.*

Two words uniformly appear without the dental throughout the LXX. *Ἄρκος* replaces *ἄρκτος* and the older (Epic) *μόλιβος* (or *μόλυβος* Ez. xxvii. 12 BAQ, Zech. v. 7 ℵ) is used to the exclusion of *μόλυβδος*[1].

τ is omitted in *Αἴγυπ[τ]ος* in the ℵ text of Jer. xxvi. 17, xlix. 14, li. 30 and in *ἔσ[τ]ιν* Is. xliii. 11, 13 ℵ (elsewhere the *σ* is lost, see below). B has *τέταρ[τ]ον* Ez. v. 12. A has *δακ[τ]ύλῳ* Lev. xvi. 14, *σκῆπ[τ]ρον* Ep. Jer. 13 (cf. *δευ[τε]ρα* R. i. 4).

δ disappears after *β* (as in *μόλυβ[δ]ος*) in *ῥάβ[δ]ον* Zech. viii. 4 ℵ. Cf. in F *δω[δε]κα* Gen. xliv. 32, *ἐ[δε]ται* Ex. xii. 45, *[δα]-μάλεως* N. xix. 9: and in D *[δι]δωμι* Gen. xlviii. 22.

θ is dropped after the other aspirated letters *χ* (*κ*) *φ*. ℵ has *ἐκ[θ]λίψω* Is. xxix. 2, *ἀπεκαλύφ[θ]η* liii. 1, *αὐτόχ[θ]ων* Jer. xiv. 8. A writes *κατεφ[θ]είρετο* 2 Ch. xxvii. 2. The omission in the case of *ἐχ[θ]ρός* seems to go back to an early copy of the Greek Lamentations: Lam. i. 9 ℵ, ii. 3 B, i. 7 A: A has this spelling (*ἔχραν*) also in Mic. ii. 8, F in N. xxxv. 20, Q in Ez. xxxv. 5.

35. *Omission of liquids.*

λ. ℵ omits (in proximity of *κ* and *β*): *ἐσκ[λ]ήρυνας* Is. lxiii. 17, cf. *σκ[λ]ηροκαρδίαν* Jer. iv. 4, *ἐπεκ[λ]ήθη* xli. 15, *εἱ[λ]κον* 4 M. xi. 9: *βι,β[λ]ίῳ* Jer. xxviii. 60, *ἐκι,β[λ]ύζωσιν* Prov. iii. 10. A has *ἐξῆ[λ]θες* Ex. xxiii. 15, *πολυοχ[λ]ίας* Job xxxix. 7, F has *ἀδε[λ]φῷ* Lev. xxi. 2.

ρ. Omission is frequent especially after the dentals *τ* (*στ*) *δ θ* (*ρθ*). ℵ has *γαστ[ρ]ί* Is. xl. 11, *(ἐπι)στ[ρ]έψει* etc. Jer. ii. 24, xviii. 20, xx. 16, *ἄστ[ρ]ων* ib. xxviii. 9, *ἀροτ[ρ]ιαθήσεται* xxxiii. 18, *ἐπαρυστ[ρ]ίδ(ες)* Zech. iv. 2 (with A), 12: *κέδ[ρ]ου* Is. xxxvii. 24, *σφόδ[ρ]α* Jer. ii. 10, Zech. ix. 9, *τετράδ[ρ]αχμον* Job xlii. 11: *ἄνθ[ρ]ωπος* Is. vi. 5, *ἐχθ[ρ]ός* Jer. xx. 5. Loss of the second *ρ* in *ὄρθ[ρ]ος ὀρθ[ρ]ίζειν* is shared by ℵ with the other uncials: so ℵ in Jer. vii. 25, xxv. 4, xxxiii. 5, xxxix. 33, xlii. 14, li. 4, Prov. vii. 18, xxiii. 35: B in Ex. ix. 13, Hos. xi. 1: A in Gen. xix. 2, Ex. xxxiv. 4: C in Sir. iv. 12. ℵ has further *μικ[ρ]ός* Is. xxii. 5, Jer. xlix. 8, *σά[ρ]ξ* Is. xlix. 26, *κατά[ρ]ξει* etc. Jl. ii. 17, Zech. vi. 13, ix. 10, *β[ρ]οῦχος* Jl. i. 4, Na. iii. 15, *φ[ρ]ύαγμα* Jer. xii. 5, *σκο[ρ]πίου* 4 M. xi. 10. B has also *πάτ[ρ]αρχον* Is. xxxvii. 38, *μέτ[ρ]ου* Ez. xlii. 17, *τ[ρ]αχεῖα* Sir. vi. 20, *ἄνδ[ρ]ες* 1 K. xxix. 2, *σφόδ[ρ]α* 2 Es. xxiii. 8. A (besides *ἐπαρυστίδες*, above) has *ἐρυθ[ρ]ᾷ· ἠρυθ[ρ]ο-δανωμένα* Ex. xv. 4, xxxix. 21, Ψ cv. 7, *ἔξαρθ[ρ]ος* 4 M. ix. 13, *κ[ρ]εάγρας* Ex. xxxviii. 23, N. iv. 14, Jer. lii. 18. F has *μίτ[ρ]αν* Lev. viii. 9, Q *στ[ρ]ουθία* Jer. viii. 7 and C *κατασφ[ρ]αγίζει* Job xxxvii. 7.

[1] Cod. A writes *μόλιβδος* in Ezekiel.

36. *Omission of* σ occurs most often before τ and π. ℵ has γα[σ]τρί Is. xxvi. 18, ἕ[σ]τιν Is. xxvii. 9, xxxi. 3, Zech. i. 9, ἄγρω[σ]τις Is. xxxvii. 27, ἀκου[σ]τήν Is. xxx. 30, ἴα[σ]πιν Is. liv. 12, δια[σ]παρμένους lvi. 8, μό[σ]χον lxvi. 3, ἕκα[σ]τος Jer. xvi. 12, xxviii. 6, νεανί[σ]κοι ib. xxx. 15, ἐπι[σ]τάτην xxxvi. 26, χρη[σ]τός xl. 11. The omission of σ in the verb ἐκ[σ]πᾶν is shared by ℵ with A: ἐκ[σ]πασθῆναι Hb. ii. 9 ℵA, ἐκ[σ]πάσατε Zech. xiii. 7 ℵ, so (in A) Am. ix. 15, Ψ xxi. 10 (ARU), xxiv. 15 and (in R) Ψ cxxviii. 6. A has also παιδί[σ]και Gen. xii. 16, ἐξόπι[σ]θεν (Epic) 4 K. xvii. 21, ἀπε[σ]χίσθη 2 Ch. xxvi. 21, ἐ[σ]φραγίσθη Est. viii. 10: [σ]τέγος Ep. Jer. 10 AQ has classical authority. B has προσοχθί[σ]ματι 4 K. xxiii. 13, ἀπε[σ]χίσθη 2 Ch. xxvi. 21 (with A). E has ἐνυπνιά[σ]θη Gen. xli. 5: F ἱ[σ]χνόφωνος Ex. iv. 10, ἐπί[σ]παστρον Ex. xxvi. 36, ἐνδο[σ]θίων Lev. viii. 16. V has [σ]κῦλα 1 M. v. 51.

Less frequent is *omission of labials* (ℵ has παρεμ[β]ολῆς Is. xxi. 8, ὑπερ[β]ήσετε Jer. v. 22, ἄμ[π]ελον Is. xvi. 9) and of *nasals*: ν is dropped by ℵ in ἀναγ[ν]ώσῃ Jer. xxviii. 61, στρωμ[ν]ή Job xli. 21, by B in ἑ[ν]στάντος 1 Es. v. 46 (with A), ἄκα[ν]θαι Is. v. 6 (with Q), βρο[ν]τῆς Is. xxix. 6, ποίμ[ν]ιον Jer. xiii. 17, by Q in Ez. xlii. 20 πε[ν]τακοσίων.

37. **Single and double consonants.** Doubled consonants in Attic Greek owe their origin to a fulness of pronunciation given to some of them, particularly to liquids and nasals[1]. From the Hellenistic period onwards (in Egypt from about 200 B.C.) the tendency has been in the direction of simplification, and in modern Greek, with the exception of certain districts of Asia and the islands, the single consonant has prevailed[2]. This phenomenon, together with the less frequent doubling of simple vowels, appears to have arisen from a shifting of the dividing-line between the syllables. Ἄλλος became ἄ|λλος and so ἄλος: reversely the closing of the open syllable in e.g. νῆσος produced νῆσσος. In the LXX uncials the Attic forms are usual, with some exceptions in Cod. ℵ and in the case of ρρ (ῥ), where there was fluctuation even in the Attic period.

[1] In Homer an initial λ lengthened a preceding vowel (πολλὰ λισσομένη *Il.* ε. 358).

[2] Thumb *Hell.* 20 ff. From the diversity of practice in the modern dialects he infers the existence of "geminierende und nichtgeminierende Κοινή-Mundarten."

38. The two following examples do not come under the head of simplification.

Καταράκτης is always written with single ρ in the uncials in accordance with the κοινή derivation[1] of the word from κατ-αράσσειν (not καταρραγῆναι).

Γένημα (unrecorded in LS ed. 8) is a new κοινή formation from γίνομαι = "produce of the earth," "fruit," and is carefully distinguished from γέννημα, "offspring" (from γεννάω)[2].

Γένημα (with πρωτογένημα) is common in LXX, always being used of the fruits of the ground except in 1 Macc. (i. 38, iii. 45) where it is applied to Jerusalem's offspring. Γέννημα appears in Jd. i. 10 BA (="descendant"), Sir. x. 18 (γεννήμασιν γυναικῶν): both books use γένημα="produce" elsewhere. In three passages there are variants, but the difference in the spelling imports a different meaning. (*a*) Gen. xlix. 21 Νεφθαλεί, στέλεχος ἀνειμένον, ἐπιδιδοὺς ἐν τῷ γενήματι (B*D*F) κάλλος. The comparison to a tree fixes the spelling: γεννήματι of A drops the metaphor. (*b*) Job Θ xxxix. 4 (of the wild goats) ἀπορρήξουσιν τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν, πληθυνθήσονται ἐν γενήματι (B א), i.e. "they will multiply among the fruits of the field," RV "in the open field" (בבר): γεννήματι of A gives בר its more familiar Aramaic meaning "son" i.e. "they will abound in offspring." (*c*) W. xvi. 19. The flame that plagued the Egyptians burnt more fiercely ἵνα ἀδίκου γῆς γενήματα (BC) διαφθείρῃ. The contrast with the "angel's food" in the next verse shows that the reference is to the destruction of the "herb of the field" and the "tree of the field" (Ex. ix. 25): γεννήματα of אA refers to the Egyptians, who themselves were struck by the hail (ibid.).

39. PP and P. The Attic rule was (to quote Blass) that "ρ, if it passes from the beginning to the middle of a word (through inflexion or composition), preserves the stronger pronunciation of the initial letter by becoming doubled." But exceptions are found in Attic Inscriptions from v/B.C.[3]

In the LXX ρρ is usual in the simple verbs: ρ is fairly frequent in the compounds. The same distinction is found in the Ptolemaic papyri.

[1] Strabo 667 (xiv. 4).
[2] Cf. Deissmann *BS* 109 f., 184, Mayser 214.
[3] Meisterhans 95. Cf. Mayser 212 f.

A distinction is also observable between groups of books. In general it may be said that, while in certain verbs ρρ is attested throughout, in others it is characteristic of the Pentateuch and some literary books, while ρ appears in the later historical books, in Psalms, in Jeremiah and Minor Prophets (in BN) and in Theodotion.

Ἄρρωστος -εῖν -ία -ημα but εὔρωστος, as in Attic, are constant in LXX. So is ἐρρέθην (five times: Jon. iii. 7 ἐρέθη N). Ῥέω has ρρ in the augmented tenses, but ἐξερύημεν Is. lxiv. 6 BNAQ, ἐξερύησαν 1 M. ix. 6 ANV (ἐρύησαν Ψ lxxvii. 20 T). Ἔρρηξα ἐρράγην etc. (including compounds) are usual: ρ in the simple verb appears once only in the B text (2 Es. xix. 11), in composition it is strongly supported in Prov. xxvii. 9 καταρήγνυται BNC and is read by BN in Jl. ii. 13, Na. i. 13, by B in 4 K. viii. 12, by N in Is. and Jer., by A in 1 K. xxviii. 17, 2 M. iv. 38. Ἐρρίζωκα -σα in Sirach: elsewhere (ἐξ)ερίζωσα etc. Ἔρριψα ἔρριμμαι etc. are usual, but ἔρ(ε)ιψα and other forms with ρ are uncontested in Dan. Θ (viii. 7, 12) and (in composition) in Job Θ xxvii. 22 and are strongly supported (usually by BN) in Jer. and Minor Prophets: in the compounds ρ is more common than ρρ. The perf. pass. loses the second medial ρ in Jer. xiv. 16 B, Bar. ii. 25 BAQ, while it sometimes takes on an initial ρ (ῥέριμμαι): Jd. iv. 22 B, xv. 15 B, Tob. i. 17 B (ἐριμμ. A), Jdth. vi. 13 A (ἐριμμ. B), Jer. xliii. 30 A (ἐριμμ. BNQ). Ῥύεσθαι has ρρ in the augmented tenses in the Pentateuch (Exodus five times: v. 23 ἐρύσω AF), but ἐρύσασθε Jos. xxii. 31 BA: in the subsequent books the MSS fluctuate between the two forms.

Ἀρραβών seems to have been the older Hellenized form of ערבון and is so written by all MSS in the three passages of Genesis where it occurs (Gen. xxxviii. 17 f., 20)[1].

40. Weakening of ρρ to ρ in words other than verbs and of λλ to λ is mainly confined to N: C and V have examples of σ for σσ.

N in the Prophets has πόρω and πόρωθεν (Is. x. 3, xxii. 3, xxix. 13, xlvi. 11: Jer. v. 15, xxxviii. 3), βορᾶν for βορρ. Is. xlix. 12 (so in a papyrus of i/B.C., the only Ptolemaic example quoted by Mayser of this form of simplification), πυρός for πυρρός Zech. i. 8, vi. 2 (with A).

Weakening of λλ to λ (in papyri from ii/B.C., especially in ἄλ[λ]ος and derivatives) occurs in παραλάσσον Est. B 5 B*,

[1] So in a papyrus of iii/B.C. Papyri of later centuries write ἀραβών almost as often as ἀρρ-: Mayser 40, J. H. Moulton *CR* xv. 33 b and *Prol.* 45, Deissmann *BS* 183 f.

διαλάσσ. W. xix. 18 ℵ, μεταλάσσ. 2 M. vii. 14 V, εὐκατάλακτον 3 M. v. 13 AV, cf. μεταλ|ενομένη W. xvi. 25 A. ℵ has also ἀγαλίαμα Is. xvi. 10, li. 3, lxv. 18, ἀγαλιᾶσθαι xxix. 19, στραγαλία lviii. 6, μέλων (=μέλλ.) lix. 5, ἀλά 4 M. iii. 1, βαλάντιον Tob. viii. 2 (elsewhere in LXX. correctly βαλλάντιον).

The single μ in ἀπέρριμαι Ψ xxx. 23 B*ℵ*U (so ἔρρειμαι in a papyrus of iii/B.C., Mayser 214) seems due to the presence of another double consonant (elsewhere ἔριμμαι, above). ℵ* has ἄμον Jer. v. 22.

Cod. V writes δυσεβής (δυσεβεῖν) in 2 and 3 Macc., on the analogy of εὐσεβής: so A once in 3 M. iii. 1. V further has ταράσοντας 1 M. iii. 5, C κασίτερον Sir. xlvii. 18.

Mutes are dropped in σαβάτων Ez. xxii. 26 B*, συγνούς 2 M. xiv. 31 A, νεοτῶν 4 M. xiv. 15 A*V*.

41. There is one instance of *doubling of single consonant* which the LXX contributes to the study of Greek orthography: it is unrecorded in the grammars. In all the 21 instances where the word occurs the classical οἷμοι is written with double μ either as οἴμμοι or ὄμμοι (the two forms in conjunction in Jer. li. 33, ὄμμοι οἴμμοι B*): the class. form is limited (in the three leading uncials) to 3 K. xvii. 20 A.

42. New verbs are coined, on the model of κεράννυμι etc., in -ννω (§ 19, 2): βέννω (for βαίνω) in the A text, ἀποκτέννω (for -κτείνω), ἀποτιννύω, φθάννω, χύννω[1].

Ἀέναος and ἔνατος retain the classical spelling (ἀέννaος in 2 M. vii. 36 V: ἔννατος [in the corrector of the same MS] does not deserve the recognition as a "LXX" form which Redpath and Mayser accord to it).

B writes Ἑλλυμαίδα Tob. ii. 10 (elsewhere Ἐλυμ.). Later MSS afford: πολλύν (on the analogy of πολλήν) Job xxix. 18 A, θρύλλημα θρυλληθείην Job xvii. 6 C, xxxi. 30 C, ἀσύλλου 2 M. iv. 34 V, ἔλλαττον xii. 4 V.

B* has νῆσσος in Ez. xxvi. 18, xxvii. 6: ℵ βύρσσης Job xvi. 16, γεῖσσος Jer. lii. 22, εὑρίσσκοντες Lam. i. 6, ἠσσθένησεν ii. 8: A ἐρρύσσω 3 M. vi. 6: C πάσσης Sir. xxxvii. 21, κλῖσσον (=κλεῖσον) xlii. 6: Q μίσσγουσιν Hos. iv. 2.

Doubling of κ, as in ἐκξελεύσεται Is. ii. 3 ℵ, ἐκξοίσω Zech. v. 4 ℵ, in the papyri appears to be not earlier than i/A.D. (ἐκξουσίαν OP ii. 259. 18 of 23 A.D.). Μογγιλάλος, a late reading (QΓB[ab])

[1] Cf. πίννω in the corrector of Q: Is. xxiv. 9, xxix. 8.

in Is. xxxv. 6, is said (Thayer) to be derived not from *μόγις* but from the adj. *μογγός*, which occurs, as Dr J. H. Moulton tells me, in BM iii. p. 241. 16 (iv/A.D.).

43. **Doubling of the aspirate.** The incorrect doubling of the aspirate where tenuis + aspirate should be written (*χχ*, *θθ*, *φφ* for *κχ*, *τθ*, *πφ*) appears occasionally in the uncials: it has good authority in some late books or portions of books.

(1) *φφ*. Σαφφώθ 2 K. xvii. 29 BA, Jer. lii. 19, Σαφφάν (Σεφφάν) 4 K. xxii. 3 ff. BA, Σαφφάθ 4 K. xxii. 14 B (=Σαφάν A): so *κεφφωθείς* Prov. vii. 22 A (*κεπφ.* B ℵ). On the other hand Σαπφείν, Ἀπφείν, Σαπφαάδ are read by B in 1 Ch. vii. 12, 15, Σαπφούς 1 M. ii. 5 ℵV (Σαφφούς A). (2) *θθ*. Μαθθάν (Μεθθανίαν) 4 K. xxiv. 17 BA, Μαθθαθά, Μαθθανιά and similar forms frequently in 2 Esdras A (and ℵ: B writes Μαθανία etc.): B has *ὑποτίθθια* in Hos. xiv. 1. On the other hand in 1 and 2 Chron. and 1 Es. A writes correctly Ματθανίας etc. (B Μανθανίας etc.). (3) *χχ*. Βάκχουρος is correctly written by BA in 1 Es. ix. 24 and in 1 Macc. Βακχίδης is usual: Βαχχίδης[1] only in vii. 8 ℵ, ix. 49 ℵV, Βακχχ. ix. 1 ℵ (so Βαχχί N. xxxiv. 22 F).

Σάπφειρος is written correctly (not *σαφφ.*), but assimilation is sometimes produced by dropping the aspirate altogether: B has *σάππ(ε)ιρος* in Is. liv. 11, Ez. i. 26, Tob. xiii. 16, so F in Ex. (xxiv. 10 *σα . π*: third letter illegible) xxviii. 18.

44. **ΣΣ and ΤΤ.** The Hellenistic language as a whole adopted the *σσ* of non-Attic dialects and abandoned the peculiarly Attic *ττ*. The latter was still employed by literary writers, even before the age of the Atticists. But the general statement that the *κοινή* used *σσ* requires some modification, and there is ground for believing that, in certain words at least, *ττ* still survived in the living language[2].

[1] Βαχχιάδος is found already in a papyrus of iii/B.C. (Mayser 182).

[2] See Thumb *Hell.* 78 ff. In MSS of the Apostolic Fathers *ττ* is frequent even in documents ordinarily addicted to vulgarisms, Reinhold 43 f. The underlying principle has now been explained by Wackernagel, *Hellenistica*, 1907, pp. 12—25. Hellenistic writers retained *ττ* in certain words which were taken over directly from Attic and were not current in another form in *κοινή*-speaking countries. Among these words was *ἡττᾶσθαι*, shown by its termination to be an Attic formation (Ionic *ἐσσοῦσθαι*): the *ττ* of the verb influenced the form of the adj., *ἧττων*, and of its synonym *ἐλάττων*, and to a less degree that of the antithetical *κρείττων*.

In the LXX the use of ττ is practically confined (1) to the three words ἐλάττων, ἧττον, κρείττων, and derivatives of the first two, (2) to the three literary writings 2, 3 and 4 Maccabees, which introduce the forms with ττ in words other than those mentioned.

45. Ἐλάττων is used in Ex. Lev. Num. Jdth. Dan. O ii. 39 and 2 Macc. (also Job xvi. 7 BAC and Sir. xx. 11 A)—16 times in all, against six examples in all of ἐλάσσων, in Genesis (i. 16, xxv. 23, xxvii. 6), Proverbs (xiii. 11, xxii. 16) and Wis. ix. 5. The distinction here is not one between vulgar and literary Greek: σσ is found in distinctly literary writings. Ἐλαττοῦν is the normal form of the classical verb in LXX, though the pass. part. appears as ἐλασσούμενος in 2 K. iii. 29 and in the latter part of Sirach (xxxiv. 27, xxxviii. 24, xli. 2, xlvii. 23 BAC: also ἠλασσώθη xlii. 21 ℵA)[1]. The post-classical verbs ἐλαττονεῖν, ἐλαττονοῦν (which appear to be unexampled outside the LXX[2]: cf. ἐξουθενέω, ἐξουδενόω, 15 above) always have ττ (excepting ἐλασσονοῦσι Prov. xiv. 34 BℵA): so also do the substantives ἐλάττωμα, ἐλάττωσις.

Ἧττων occurs 11 times (of which six are in 2 Macc.), ἧσσων only twice (Job v. 4: Is. xxiii. 8). Ἡττᾶσθαι (ἡττᾶν)[3] is always so written (common in Isaiah, four times elsewhere) and ἥττημα in the one passage where the word occurs (Is. xxxi. 8).

The proportion is reversed in the case of κρείσσων, which occurs without variant in the uncials in 47 instances (mainly in Proverbs and Sirach) as against four examples only of ττ without variant (Prov. iii. 14 κρεῖττον, Sir. xxiii. 27 do., Est. i. 19 κρείττονι, Ez. xxxii. 21 κρείττων) and seven with variant σσ (Jd. viii. 2 A: Prov. xxv. 24 BℵA: W. xv. 17 B: Sir. xix. 24 BℵA, xx. 31 ℵA: Is. lvi. 5 BΓ: Ep. Jer. 67 B).

46. The three literary writings which stand at the end of the Septuagint, among other Atticisms, make a freer use of Attic ττ, but not to the entire exclusion of σσ.

2 Macc. has:

γλωττοτομεῖν vii. 4 V (σσ A)	but γλῶσσα (3 times).
θᾶττον iv. 31, v. 21, xiv. 11.	
πράττειν (ἀντι-) (3 times).	
κατασφάττειν v. 12 V (-σφάζειν A).	
ταράττειν xv. 19 V (σσ A)	but ἐπιταράσσειν ix. 24 AV.

[1] Contrast ἐλαττούμενος Sir. xvi. 23, xix. 23, xxv. 2. The distinction suggests an early division of the book into two parts (cf. § 5).

[2] The former in an O.T. quotation in 2 Cor. viii. 15.

[3] See note 2, p. 121.

τάττειν x. 28 AV — but *ἐπιτάσσειν* ix. 8 V. / *προστάσσειν* xv. 5 AV.

φρυάττεσθαι (*φρύττ.*) vii. 34 AV.

διαφυλάττειν vi. 6, x. 30 V but *-φυλάσσειν* iii. 22 A, x. 30 A.

2 Macc. further keeps *σσ* in *μεταλλάσσειν*, *βδελύσσεσθαι*, *δράσσεσθαι*, *περισσῶς*, *(ἐκ)πλήσσειν*, *ἐντινάσσειν*.

3 Macc. has:

προστάττειν v. 37 — but *-τάσσειν* v. 3, 40. *φυλάσσειν* etc.

4 Macc. has:

βδελύττεσθαι v. 7.

γλῶττα x. 17, 21 — but *γλῶσσα* x. 19, xviii. 21.

γλωττοτομεῖν x. 19 ℵ (*σσ* A), xii. 13.

νεοτ(τ)ός xiv. 15 — but *νοσσία* xiv. 19. / *νοσσοποιεῖν* xiv. 16.

πράττειν iii. 20.

φρίττειν xiv. 9, xvii. 7.

It further keeps *σσ* in *μέλισσα*, *φυλάσσειν*.

Apart from this triplet of books and the triplet of words above-mentioned *σσ* is universal in the LXX, except that *φυλάττειν* occurs twice in the last chapter of Jeremiah (probably a later appendix to the Greek version) lii. 24 B, 31 A, and twice as a variant reading elsewhere: Job xxix. 2 A, W. xvii. 4 AC.

Σήμερον, *σευτλίον* (Is. li. 20) have initial *σ*, not *τ*.

47. **ΡΣ and ΡΡ.** The use of the later Attic *ρρ* is in the following words practically restricted to a few literary portions of the LXX.

Ἄρσην, *ἀρσενικός*, *θαρσεῖν*, *θαρσύνειν* (Est. C 23, 4 M. xiii. 8 *παρεθ.*) are the ordinary forms in use. *Ἄρρην* is confined to Sir. xxxvi. 26, 4 M. xv. 30, cf. *ἀρρενωδῶς* 2 M. x. 35 (a *ἅπ. λεγ.*), *θαρρεῖν* to Prov. i. 21 BℵAC, xxix. 29 ℵ (*θαρσεῖ* BA), Bar. iv. 21 B (*ρσ* AQ), 27 B (do.) (but *ρσ* iv. 5, 30), Dan. O vi. 16, 4 M. xiii. 11, xvii. 4, *θαρραλέος* (*-έως*) to 3 M. i. 4, 23, 4 M. iii. 14, xiii. 13.

In addition to these examples, the adjective *πυρρός*, with derivatives *πυρράκης* *πυρρίζειν*, keeps *ρρ* throughout the LXX, as in the papyri (Mayser 221): *πυρσός* was an alternative Attic form, used in poetry. The later Attic forms *πόρρω* *πόρρωθεν* are used to the exclusion of the older *πρόσω* (*πόρσω*).

The contracted form *βορρᾶς* (*ρρ* resulting from *ρj*, Kühner-Blass i. 1. 386) which appears in Attic inscriptions from c. 400 B.C., is practically universal in the LXX, as it is in the papyri (Mayser 252). The older *βορέας* appears only in Proverbs

(xxv. 23, xxvii. 16), Sirach (xliii. 17, 20: in 20 B has the Ionic *βορέης*) and Job Θ xxvi. 7.

On the other hand *μυρσίνη, μυρσινών, χέρσος* are written.

§ 8. The Aspirate.

1. The practice of dropping the aspirate, which began in early times in the Ionic and Aeolic dialects in Asia Minor, gradually spread, until, as in modern Greek, it ceased to be pronounced altogether[1]. In the Alexandrian age it appears to have been still pronounced[2], but the tendency towards deaspiration has set in.

2. **Irregular insertion of the aspirate.** On the other hand, there is considerable evidence for a counter-tendency in the *κοινή*, namely to insert an aspirate in a certain group of words which in Attic had none. The principal words are *ἑλπίς, ἕτος, ἰδεῖν* and cognate words, *ἴδιος, ἴσος*. These forms are attested too widely to be regarded as due to ignorance —to a reaction against the prevailing tendency, causing the insertion of the *h* in the wrong place: they represent a genuine alternative pronunciation. Grammarians are divided on the question whether these forms are "analogy formations within the *κοινή*,"[3] *καθ' ἕτος*, e.g., being formed on the analogy of *καθ' ἡμέραν*, or whether they go back to the age of the dialects[4], and the aspirate is a substitute for the lost digamma, which once was present in all the five words mentioned. The older explanation of the aspirate by the lost digamma has the support of Blass and Hort and it does not appear why it should be given up[5]. Another explanation must be sought for

[1] Thumb, *Untersuch. über den Spiritus asper* 87, puts its final disappearance at about iv/–v/ A.D.

[2] Ib. 79.

[3] Thumb *Hell.* 64.

[4] Schwyzer *Perg. Inschriften* 118 ff.

[5] Dr J. H. Moulton (*Prol.* 44 note) regards it as untenable, but without giving reasons. Thumb in his earlier work admits the possibility of this explanation in some cases (*Spir. Asp.* 71 *ὑφιδόμενος*, 11 *ἕτος*).

a recurrent instance like ὀλίγος, which never had a digamma, and in some cases analogy is doubtless responsible.

3. The LXX examples of these words are as follows:

(1) **ἐλπίς**[1] in ἐφ' ἐλπίδι twice in B, Jd. xviii. 27, Hos. ii. 18 (as against eight examples of ἐπ' (μετ') ἐλπ., including Jd. xviii. 7 B, 10 B). Ἀφελπίζειν has good authority in Sirach (xxii. 21 B א, xxvii. 21 B*AC): א has it in Est. C 30, Jdth. ix. 11, while (A)T have ἐφελπίζειν in Ψ (li. 9 T, and six times in Ψ 118 AT): in all there are 11 examples of ἀφ- ἐφελπίζειν against three of ἀπ- ἐπ- without variant (4 K. xviii. 30: Is. xxix. 19: 2 M. ix. 18).

(2) **ἔτος** in ἐφέτιον Dt. xv. 18 BAF (=ἐπέτειον) (so the papyri have καθ' ἔτος, ἐφ' ἔτη since 225 B.C.[2] beside κατ' (ἐπ') ἔτ. which are more common: LXX has κατὰ (κατ' V) ἔτος in 2 M. xi. 3, the only example of the phrase). The analogy of καθ' ἔτος seems to have produced καθ' ἐνιαυτόν[3] Dt. xiv. 21 B* (elsewhere in LXX κατ' ἐπ' μετ' ἐνιαυτόν regularly, 27 examples).

(3) **ἴδου, ἀφιδεῖν**[4] etc. are exceedingly common in LXX. In the B text οὐχ ἰδού is practically universal, occurring no less than 27 times, as against six examples only of οὐκ ἰδού (Dt. xi. 30 BAF, xxxii. 34 BF: Jos. xxii. 20 BA: 3 K. viii. 53 B, xvi. 28 c B: Is. lxvi. 9, where א has οὐχ). A unites with B in reading οὐχ ἰδού in 1 K. xxiii. 19, usually in 3 and 4 K., Sir. xviii. 17 (B*אA) and Zech. iii. 2 (B*אAΓ). Οὐχ ἴδ(ον) occurs in 4 K. ii. 12 A: Dan. Θ x. 7 B*: κάθιδε in Dt. xxvi. 15 B, while A and the other uncials furnish nine examples of similar forms, ἐφίδοι Gen. xxxi. 49 A, ἔφιδ(εν) Ψ liii. 9 R*T, xci. 12 AT, cxi. 8 אT, ἐφιδεῖν 1 M. iii. 59 AאV, 2 M. viii. 2 AV, ἔφ(ε)ιδε 2 M. i. 27 A, ἀφιδών 3 M. vi. 8 A, 4 M. xvii. 23 Aא. Even οὐχ ὄψομαι (which Blass calls a "clerical error") has an established position: there are nine examples (as against 24 of undisputed οὐκ ὄψ.); N xiv. 23 B*: Ψ xlviii. 10 B*, 20 B*T, lxxxviii. 49 T, cxiii. 13 T, cxxxiv. 16 T: Jdth. vii. 27 A: Jer. v. 12 B*A, xii. 4 B*. With these instances may be classed οὐχ οἵδας Zech. iv. 13 א.

For οὐχ ἰδού, οὐκ ἰδού in 3 K. see p. 70.

The almost universal employment of ογχιδογ in B may be partly due to the influence of the form οὐχί. Οὐχὶ ἰδού occurs in Acts ii. 7 B, but not apparently in LXX. The origin of this rendering of הלא, *nonne*, is not clear, as there is no equivalent in the Heb. for ἰδού. Only in 2 Ch. xxv. 26 do we find the combination הלא הנם "Behold are they not (written)?,"

[1] So in an Attic Inscription as early as 432 B.C. (Meisterhans 86).

[2] Mayser 199 f. Cf. Moulton *CR* xv. 33, xviii. 106 f.

[3] So μεθ' ἑν. (158 B.C.), ἐφ' ἑν. in the papyri, Mayser 200, *CR* xviii. 107.

[4] Ἐφιδεῖν in a papyrus of iii/B.C. and frequently under the Empire, Mayser 201.

contrast xxxvi. 8 הנם. The present writer would suggest that *οὐχ ἰδού* originated in a doublet. The interrogative הלא is only an alternative mode of expressing the positive הנה, and in Chron. הנה sometimes replaces הלא in the parallel passages in Kings. הלא is principally rendered by (1) *οὐχ ἰδού*, (2) *οὐκ* or *οὐχ*, (3) *ἰδού* nine times e.g. Dt. iii. 11. It is suggested that at least in the earlier books the oldest rendering was in all cases *ἰδού*, the translators preferring the positive statement to the rhetorical question. Οὐχ(ί) was an alternative rendering, and out of the two arose the conflate ογχιδογ. This in time became the recognised equivalent for the classical *ἆρ' οὐ;* The textual evidence given in the larger Cambridge LXX in the first passage where *οὐχ ἰδού* appears (Gen. xiii. 9) favours this explanation.

(4) **ἴδιος** appears in *καθ' ἰδίαν*[1] 2 M. ix. 26 V* (*κατ'* A), as against three examples of *κατ' ἰδ.* all in this book: also in the three chief uncials in Jdth. v. 18 (*οὐχ ἰδίαν* ℵA, *οὐχ ἡδ.* B).

The itacism in B in the last passage recurs in Prov. v. 19 ℵ and causes occasional confusion between *ἡδύς* and *ἴδιος*. In Sir. xxii. 11 e.g. *ἤδιον κλαῦσον* of Bℵ "weep more tenderly" (for the dead than for the fool) is doubtless the meaning, though *ἴδιον κλαῦσον* of AC would yield a tolerable sense "keep a special mourning for the dead" (the Heb. is not extant here).

(5) **ἴσος**[2] is aspirated in *ἔφισος* Sir. ix. 10 BℵC (εφ'ισοc B*), xxxiv. 27 Bℵ (the only occurrences in LXX: unaspirated in the editions of Polyb. 3. 115. 1) and in *οὐχ ἰσωθήσεται* Job Θ xxviii. 17 B*ℵA, 19 B*ℵ (the only other example of the verb is indeterminate as regards aspirate).

Another form well-attested elsewhere is **ἐφιορκεῖν** *-ια*: so 1 Es. i. 46 B: W. xiv. 28 A, 25 C (but *ἐπίορκος* Zech. v. 3 all uncials): due to throwing back the aspirate of *ὅρκος*[3].

4. **Ὀλίγος** seems to belong to a later period[4] than the preceding cases of aspiration and is not so uniformly attested in LXX as in N.T.: with *οὐχ* Is. x. 7 ℵA, Job x. 20 B*, 2 M. viii. 6 V (*οὐκ ὀλ.* 2 M. x. 24, xiv. 30), with *μεθ'* only in Jdth. xiii. 9 B* (as against five examples of *μετ' ἐπ' κατ' ὀλ.*).

There being no digamma here to explain the aspirate, its explanation may perhaps be found in the gamma. The word often appears in the papyri as *ὀλίος* (§ 7. 29): the weak spirant

[1] So in Attic Inscriptions from 250 B.C. (Meisterhans 87) and elsewhere in the *κοινή*.

[2] As early as iv/B.C. in the phrase *ἐφ' ἴσῃ* (*καὶ ὁμοίᾳ*): Thumb *Asp.* 71, Schwyzer 119 f.

[3] Or to mixture of *ἐφορκέω ἐπιορκέω* (Thumb *ib.* 72).

[4] In papyri of ii/iii/A.D., *CR* xv. 33 (add *οὐχ ὀλ.* BM ii. 411 c. 170 A.D., ib. 411 c. 346 A.D.) but not in those of the Ptolemaic age.

sound of the γ may have been thrown back on to the first syllable. For initial γ replacing the usual aspirate cf. *τὴν δὲ γῖσην* (?=*ἴσην*) Teb. 61. 233 (118 B.C.): but see p. 111, n. 4.

Καθ' *ἑμαυτόν* 2 M. ix. 22 AV is due to analogy (*καθ' ἑαυτόν*). Ἴσχυ(ρος) in *οὐχ ἱσχυραί* 1 Es. iv. 32 B*, 34 AB*^{vid}, *οὐχ ἱσχύω* Is. l. 2 A and Q, has old authority[1].

In transliterated proper names such as Ἰούδας (e.g. *οὐχ Ἰούδα* Dan. Θ, Sus. 56 BAQ) the aspirate in the second radical in the Heb. (יהודה) is sometimes thrown back to the first syllable.

5. Sporadic examples of irregular aspiration follow, mainly clerical errors. *Οὐχ ἁγαπᾷ* Prov. xxii. 14 a A, *οὐχ ἀνοίγει* Is. liii. 7 B* *bis*: *καθ' εἰκόνα* Sir. xvii. 3 B*א* (? due to lost digamma or to preceding *καθ' ἑαυτούς*), *οὐχ εἰσακούσομαι* Jer. vii. 16 B*A, *οὐχ εἰσήνεγκαν* Dan. Θ vi. 18 B*: *ἀφήλιψα* Is. xliv. 22 א* with *οὐχ ἠλειψάμην* Dan. Θ x. 3 B, *οὐχ ἥκουσαν* Is. lxvi. 4 B* (due to *οὐχ ὑπήκ. ib.*): clerical errors in א are *ἐφ' ὄνων* Is. xxx. 6, *ἐφ' οὑδενός* 4 M. xv. 11: *ἐφ' ὥμοις* Ep. Jer. 25 B* is a solitary example in LXX of aspiration of this word (cf. Lat. *humerus*), *ἑπ'* being used before it 13 times, once in this Epistle: *οὐχ ὠδῖνες* Jer. xiii. 21 אA may be a corruption of *οὐχὶ ὠδ.*

(LXX has only *ἀπ- ἐξαπ- ἐπ- ἑσταλκα*, not *ἀφέσταλκα* etc. [reduplication as in *ἕστηκα*, Thumb *op. cit.* 70] as often in the *κοινή*.)

6. **Loss of aspirate (psilosis).** As the tendency towards deaspiration continually increased between the dates of the LXX autographs and of the uncials, the evidence of the latter is of doubtful value. The most noticeable feature in it is the marked preference in Cod. B for unaspirated *ὑ* (and for *εὑ* in *εὑρίσκω*).

7. One example stands apart from the rest and is well attested in the *κοινή*, namely the dropping of the aspirate in the perfect of *ἵστημι*. This, however, does not in the LXX take place as a rule in the old perf. *ἕστηκα*, "I stand," but in the new transitive perf. *-έστακα*, "I have set up," with its corresponding passive *-έσταμαι*, the psilosis being perhaps due to the analogy of the trans. aorist *ἔστησα*[2].

[1] Meisterhans 87 (Ἰσχύλος).

[2] Or to that of *ἑσταλκα*, Thumb *op. cit.* 70. Mayser 203 quotes two examples of *ἀπέστηκα* from Ptolemaic papyri, in one of which the verb is transitive: the intrans. perf. is elsewhere *ἀφέστηκα*.

Κατέστακα has strong support in Jer. i. 10 BNA, vi. 17 BNA, 1 M. x. 20 NV (but ἀφέστακα trans. Jer. xvi. 5 BQ, ἀφέστηκα NA: 1 M. xi. 34 εστάκαμεν is indeterminate). Κατεσταμένος is written by B seven times[1], once being supported by A, which also has this form in Jer. xx. 1 and ἐπεσταμένη *ib.* v. 27. Psilosis in other forms of the perfect and in the present occur sporadically: (*a*) ἐπεστῶτα Jdth. x. 6 B, ἐπεστηκώς Zech. i. 10 N, κατεστήκεισαν 3 M. iii. 5 V: (*b*) ἐπιστημει *sic* Jer. li. 11 A, ὑπίσταται Prov. xiii. 8 N, ἐπίσταται W. vi. 8 B (so in N.T., 1 Thess. v. 3 BNL).

8. The following examples occur of unaspirated tenuis:

(i) Before *a*(η). Οὐκ ἠγιάσατε N. xxvii. 14 B, οὐκ ἠγνίσθησαν 2 Ch. xxx. 3 A (cf. ἅγος ἄγος). Οὐκ ἄψεσθε (-εται) has good support in the Pentateuch: Ex. xix. 13 B, Lev. xi. 8 BA, xii. 4 BF, N. iv. 15 B (cf. ἐπάπτοιτο in a Phocian Inscription, Thumb *Asp.* 36 f.). Οὐκ ἁρπ(ᾶ) L. xix. 13 BAF. Οὐκ ἁμαρτήσ(ομαι) Sir. xxiv. 22 B, Eccl. vii. 21 C, perhaps due in both cases to the οὐκ in the balancing clauses: cf. οὐκ ἡμάρτηκεν 1 K. xix. 4 B. Confusion of αὐτή and αὖτη is natural: οὐκ precedes the pronoun where αὖτη is clearly meant in e.g. 4 K. vi. 19 A *bis*, Is. xxiii. 7 N, Dan. Θ iv. 27 A.

(ii) Before ε. Οὐκ ἐκών Ex. xxi. 13 BA (on the analogy of ἄκων: conversely ἀκούσιος on an Attic Inscription): οὐκ ἕνεκεν Jos. xxii. 26 BA, 28 BA, Is. xlviii. 10 NAQ: οὐκ ἑτοιμασθήσεται 1 K. xx. 31 B: οὐκ ἐψήσεις Ex. xxiii. 19 B=Dt. xiv. 20 B: οὐκ ἐωράκα(σιν) Dt. xxi. 7 B, xxxiii. 9 B: κατ' ἐκάστην Ψ xli. 11 N (so in iii/B.C., Mayser 202, and earlier, Thumb *op. cit.* 61). Ἕλκω loses its aspirate in οὐκ εἵλκυσεν Dt. xxi. 3 B, Sir. xxviii. 19 N and in Ep. J. 43 ἀπ- ἐπ- ελκυσθ(εῖσα) AQ (against four examples of ἐφελκ- without v.l.).

(iii) Before η. Οὐκ has strong support before forms from ἡσυχάζειν viz. Jer. xxix. 6 BAQ, Prov. vii. 11 BNA (but μεθ' ἡσυχίας Sir. xxviii. 16) and ἥκειν, Jer. v. 12 NQ, xxiii. 17 BN, xxv. 16 N, Hg. i. 2 AQ, cf. Prov. x. 30 B[2]. The loss of the aspirate in ἡμεῖς (2 M. vi. 17 ταῦτ' ἡμῖν εἰρήσθω) is common elsewhere: Mayser 202 gives an example of iii/B.C. Ἀπηλιώτης "east" appears to have been an Ionic coinage which was adopted in Attic Greek and is the invariable form in LXX and papyri (Mayser 203).

(iv) Before ι. The MSS afford a few examples: οὐκ (ὀκ) ἱκανός Is. xl. 16 N *bis*, οὐκ ἱλάσθης Lam. iii. 42 AQ, μετ' ἵππου

[1] N. iii. 32, xxxi. 48: 2 K. iii. 39: 3 K. ii. 35 h (with A), iv. 7, v. 16: 2 Ch. xxxiv. 10. On the other hand there are eight examples of καθεστ. without v.l.

[2] The only examples of undisputed οὐχ before ἥκειν are 1 K. xxix. 9: Jer. ii. 31.

1 Es. ii. 25 A (cf. the old form *ἵκκος*, Lat. *equus*), *κατιπτάμενα* Sir. xliii. 17 B.

(v) Before *ο*, *ω*. *Ὅμοιος* loses its aspirate in Prov. xxvii. 19 C *οὐκ ὅμοια*: cf. *οὐκ ὁμοεθνῶν* 2 M. v. 6 AV. The definite art. twice loses its aspirate in the same phrase *οὐκ ὁ φόβος* Job iv. 6 BℵC, xxxiii. 7 Bℵ, apparently owing to the aspirated consonant which follows it: so in Job xxxii. 7 B, Bar. ii. 17 A (Mayser 203 gives an example of ii/B.C.). *Οὐκ* is used before *ὠδήγησεν* Ex. xiii. 17 B, *ὡραῖος* Sir. xv. 9 ℵ, *ὡς* Is. viii. 14 ℵ.

(vi) Before *ευ*, *υ*[1]. Loss of aspirate in *εὑρίσκω* (partly perhaps through analogy with compounds of *εὖ*) is frequent in the B text, which has 12 examples of *οὐκ εὑρεθήσεται* etc. (nine in the historical books between Ex. xii. 19 and 2 K. xvii. 20) to 57 of *οὐχ*: in A the proportion is 4 to 69. Other uncials supply half a dozen examples between them. The later papyri from ii/A.D. afford parallels (Crönert 146), but there is no certain instance in the Ptolemaic age of *εὑρίσκω* or of *ὑ*, so that B in the above examples and in those which follow is unreliable.

B has some 20 examples of initial *ὑ*, ℵ 5, A 3, Q 2, C and V one each. The commonest examples are *οὐκ ὑπάρχ(ει)* Job Θ xxxviii. 26 BℵA, B in Sir. xx. 16, Tob. iii. 15, vi. 15 (with ℵ), Q in Am. v. 5, Ob. 16 and *οὐκ ὑπελεί(φθη)* which B writes seven times. *Οὐχ*, however, largely preponderates with both verbs. It is needless to enumerate other examples of *οὐκ* before compounds of *ὑπό*, *ὑπέρ*: *κατυφανεῖς* Ex. xxviii. 17 B, *κατύπερθε* 3 M. iv. 10 AV (as in Ionic, Hdt. ii. 5) may be mentioned.

For *οὐθείς*, *μηθείς* and other peculiarities of aspiration in the middle of words see § 7.

§ 9. Euphony in combination of Words and Syllables[2].

1. **Division of words.** The practice of dividing the individual words in writing did not become general till long after the time of the composition of the LXX. This accounts for an occasional coalescence of two words, particularly where the first ends and the second begins with one of the weak

[1] The Boeotian dialect was the one exception to the old rule that every initial *υ* was aspirated (Thumb *Asp.* 42).

[2] A comprehensive term embracing Assimilation of consonants, Variable final consonant, Elision, Crasis and Hiatus seems wanting, analogous to the German Satzphonetik.

final letters ς or ν (cf. οὕτω(ς), μέχρι(ς), ἐστί(ν) etc.). Instances like εἰστήλην τὰσπόνδας appear already in Attic Inscriptions of iv/B.C.[1] and become common in papyri from ii/B.C. onwards[2]. The LXX remains practically free from this blending of words, the only well-supported example being πρὸστόμα, 2 Es. xii. 13 BℵA.

Of individual MSS, Cod. ℵ has several examples in the Minor Prophets: εἰσκότος Jl. ii. 31, ὡσμῖλας (ὡσμίλαξ A) Na. i. 10, ἵπτουσου Hb. iii. 8, ὡσφραγῖδα Hg. ii. 23 (cf. ἐνάγεβ Ob. 19): so εἰσκάνδαλον 1 K. xviii. 21 A, Ψ cv. 36 A, ἀνοίξηστόμα Sir. xxii. 22 A, ἔωσπινθῆρος xlii. 22 C, ὡσφραγίς xlix. 11 B*, τῆσβεστικῆς W. xix. 20 A, εἰσφαγήν Job xxvii. 14 C.

2. A rather different kind of blending of words takes place where a final κ and an initial σ are amalgamated into the compound letter ξ. B has ἐξαβά for ἐκ Σαβά in Is. lx. 6, and ἐξοῦ (Swete ἐξ οὗ) for ἐκ σοῦ (ממך) in Mic. v. 2: ℵ has the same orthography in Na. i. 11. ℵ further has ἐξ for ἐκ in Mal. ii. 12 ἐξ σκηνωμάτων[3].

3. **Assimilation of consonants.** In contrast with the occasional coalescence of words referred to in the last section is the general tendency of the Hellenistic language towards greater perspicuity by isolating not merely individual words but also the constituent elements of words. Dissimilation, rather than assimilation, is the rule. This tendency is observable not only in the absence of assimilation in many words compounded with ἐν and σύν, but also in the rarity of elision and crasis, and in the formation of compound words in which an unelided vowel is retained[4].

[1] Meisterhans 90 f. (with one exception, only where the second word begins with σκ στ σπ or σφ): cf. 111 ἑστήλῃ = ἐν στ. etc. from v/B.C.

[2] Mayser 216, 191 f., 205 ff.

[3] Cf. ἑξαλαμῖνος and ἐξ Σαλαμῖνος (iv/B.C.) Meisterhans 105 f., and for examples in the papyri Mayser 225.

[4] E.g. in LXX γραμματοεισαγωγεύς, ἀρχιεταῖρος, ἀρχιευνοῦχος (ἀρχευν. Dan. Θ i. 9, 11, 18 B), ἀρχιϊερωσύνην 1 M. xiv. 38 A, μακροημερεύειν, ἀλλοεθνής, ὁμοεθνής, μισόυβρις 3 M. vi. 9 A (cf. καταοικοῦσα Jer. xxvi. 19 ℵ).

4. This tendency, however, did not at once become universal in the Hellenistic period. There is a well-marked division in this respect between the earlier papyri (c. 300—150 B.C.) and the later (after 150 B.C.). In the earlier period not only is *assimilation* in compounds usual[1], but it is extended to *two contiguous words*. There are numerous examples in papyri of iii/B.C. of the assimilation of final ν (mainly in monosyllabic words) to μ before labials, to γ before gutturals (*τὸμ παῖδα, ἐμ μηνί, ἐγ κροκοδίλων πόλει* etc.), though the practice is going out and the non-assimilated forms predominate[2]. After 150 B.C. these forms practically disappear, though the assimilation of κ to γ in *ἐγ δίκης* etc. lingers on as late as iii/A.D.

Of this class of assimilation the LXX only exhibits two recurrent examples, one of which is limited to Cod. A, while the other is most widely attested in that MS. Ἐγ *γαστρί*[3] is confined to A which has 19 examples of it (once *ἐκ γαστρί*, Job xv. 35) to 14 of *ἐν γαστρί*. Ἐμ *μέσῳ* or *ἐμμέσῳ* ("apparently Alexandrian" WH) occurs some 200 times in A, while B has 17 examples (mainly in Ψ and Sir.), and ℵ 3: there are also instances of it in the uncials E, F, T (in Ψ), C (Sir.), Γ (Prophets): the only passages where it is supported by all the principal uncials are Lev. xxv. 33 BAF, Is. vi. 5 BℵAΓ.

Apart from these two phrases, the only similar forms noted in the uncials are *ἐμητρός* (=*ἐκ μ.*) Gen. xx. 12 A*, *ἐχειρός* (=*ἐκ χ.*) Ex. xviii. 8 A*, Ψ xxi. 21 U, xxx. 16 U, *ἀπαρχὴμ τῶν* Ψ lxxvii. 51 R, *ἐμμεσημβρινῇ* Is. xvi. 3 ℵ. Assimilation never takes place, as in the papyri, in *ἐν μηνί, ἐκ δεξιῶν, ἐκ μέρους* etc. The papyri would lead us to expect more examples of such assimilation, at least in the Pentateuch, and it is probable that a larger number of them stood in the autographs. Cf. § 7, 4 and 9.

[1] Mayser 233 ff.

[2] Ib. 229 ff.: cf. Meisterhans 110 ff. Contrast the usual opening formula of a will of iii/B.C. *εἴη* **μέμ** *μοι ὑγιαίνοντι κ.τ.λ.* with *εὐορ]κοῦντι μέν μοι εὖ εἴη* BM ii. 181 (64 A.D.), *εἴη μέν μοι ὑγιαίνειν* Lp. 29 (295 A.D.).

[3] Found in a papyrus of iii/B.C., Mayser 231.

5. A few instances occur of *irregular assimilation within the word*: βοββήσει (for βομβ.) 1 Ch. xvi. 32 B*, cf. ἐβόββησεν Jer. xxxviii. 36 ℵ, σάππιγγος (=σάλπ.) Jer. vi. 17 ℵ, ἄσσει (=ἅλσει) 4 K. xxi. 7 A, παρράσιν (=πατρ.) Ez. xlvii. 14 A, ἐκλιμμήσει (=-λικμ.) W. v. 23 A, συνμίσσει (=-μίσγ.) 2 M. xiv. 16 A.

6. As regards *assimilation of final ν in composition* (compounds of ἐν, σύν etc.), the papyri show that assimilation was still the rule in iii/B.C. and the first half of ii/B.C., while after *c.* 150 B.C. the growing tendency to isolate the separate syllables produces a great increase in the number of unassimilated forms. Before labials assimilation remains longer in force than before gutturals. Mayser's table[1] exhibits the contrast between these two centuries.

According to the oldest MSS of the LXX the general rule is that ἐν and σύν remain unassimilated before the gutturals, but are assimilated before the labials. Newly-formed words generally retain the constituent parts unassimilated, whereas assimilation is usual in old and common words, in which the preposition has begun to lose its force. As regards individual books, Ψ, Prov. and Dan. Θ nearly always have the later unassimilated forms. The following list shows the normal practice of the uncials with regard to individual words: words in which the evidence is indecisive are omitted[2].

Unassimilated	Assimilated
Compounds of ἐν.	
Before gutturals:	
γ- ἐνγαστρίμυθος, ἔνγραπτος. ἐνγράφειν.	

[1] 234. Final ν in composition

	before labials		before gutturals	
	is assimilated	not assim.	assim.	not assim.
in iii/B.C.	58 times	8	58	14
in ii/B.C.	44	35	45	52

[2] Cf. WH² App. 156 f.

κ-	ἐνκάθετος ἐνκαθίζειν ἐνκαλύπτειν ἔνκαρπος ἐνκατάλειμμα -λιμπάνειν ἐνκαταπαίζειν ἐνκαυχᾶσθαι ἐνκρατεῖν ἐνκρούειν ἐνκυλίειν.	ἐγκαλεῖν ἐγκαταλείπειν (except in Ψ) ἐγκλείειν ἐγκρατής -κράτεια ἐγκώμιον -κωμιάζειν.
χ-	ἐνχρίειν ἐνχρονίζειν.	ἐγχεῖν.

Before labials, on the other hand, there is undisputed authority for :

β-		ἐμβάλλειν ἐμβατεύειν ἐμβιβάζειν ἐμβίωσις ἐμβλέπειν etc.
π-	ἐνπαραγίνεσθαι (Prov.) ἐνπεριπατεῖν (Prov. B ℵ A, and elsewhere in one of the uncials) ἐνπηγνύναι (1 K. Ψ).	ἐμπαίζειν (and derivatives) ἐμπειρεῖν -ος -ία ἐμπιπλάναι ἐμπιπράναι ἐμπίπτειν ἐμπλατύνειν ἐμπλέκειν ἐμποδίζειν ἐμπορεύεσθαι ἐμπορία -πόριον ἔμπροσθεν.
φ-		ἐμφαίνειν ἐμφανής ἐμφανίζειν ἔμφοβος ἐμφράσσειν ἐμφυσᾶν.
μ-		ἐμμανής ἐμμελέτημα ἐμμένειν ἔμμονος (except Sir) ἐμμολύνειν.

Compounds of *σύν*.

Before gutturals :

γ-	συνγραφή συνγράφειν.	συγγενής -γένεια (-νία).
κ-	συνκαίειν συνκαλεῖν συνκαταβαίνειν συνκαταφαγεῖν συνκλᾶν -κλασμός συνκλείειν συνκλύζειν συνκρίνειν.	
χ-		συγχεῖν.

Before labials etc. :

β-		συμβίωσις -τής (except Dan. Θ) σύμβουλος -εύειν.
π-	συνπαραγίνεσθαι (Ψ) συν-	σύμπας[1] συμποδίζειν

[1] In Eccles. *σὺν πάντα* etc. should be read as two words, *σύν* being Aquila's rendering of אֶת: alteration to *σύμπαντα* was natural and B so reads in every passage except the first (i. 14). Of *σύνπας* for *σύμπας* the only examples are Na. i. 5 ℵ A, Ψ ciii. 28 R, cxviii. 91 AR.

	-παραμένειν (Ψ) συνπαρεῖναι συνπαριστάναι (Ψ) συνπερι--φέρεσθαι συνπίνειν συνποιεῖν συνπονεῖν συνπροπέμπειν.	*συμπορεύεσθαι* (except Dt) *συμπόσιον -σία.*
φ-		*συμφέρειν συμφορά συμφράσσειν σύμφυτος.*
μ-	*συνμίσγειν* (1 and 2 M.) *συνμιγής* (Dan. Θ)	*συμμαχεῖν -ία -ος σύμμετρος συμμιγνύναι σύμμικτος σύμμιξις.*
λ-		*συλλαμβάνειν συλλέγειν.*
σ-	*συνσεισμός* (late word)	*συσκοτάζειν σύσσημον σύστασις σύστεμα* (*-ημα*) *συστρέφειν -στρεμμα -στροφή.*

LXX compounds of *σύν* followed by *ρ* are few: *συνράπτειν, συνράσσειν, συνρέμβεσθαι* are attested.

In compounds with *παν-* (mainly in 2, 3 and 4 M.) the MSS are divided, but want of assimilation (e.g. *πανκρατής, πανβασιλεύς, πανμελής, πανπόνηρος*) is the prevailing rule, many of these words being new. On the other hand *παρρησία, παρρησιάζεσθαι* are always so written.

7. **Variable final consonants.** It has been well established that the insertion of the so-called "**νῦ ἐφελκυστικόν**" was not, either in Attic times or in the earlier Hellenistic period, mainly due to a desire to avoid hiatus. In Attic Inscriptions from 500—30 B.C. it is inserted more frequently before consonants than before vowels[1]. Traces of a growing tendency to use the variable final consonant to avoid hiatus may perhaps be found in the papyri[2], "but as far as we know the [modern] rule was only formulated in the Byzantine era[3]." The difference between Attic and Hellenistic Greek consists in the greatly increased use in the latter of the final *ν*, which in some forms has practically become an invariable appendage.

In the MSS of the LXX, as in the Ptolemaic papyri[4], the insertion of *ν* in *ἐστί(ν)* and in verbal forms in *-ε(ν)* is almost universal before both consonants and vowels. In other verbal

[1] Meisterhans 114.
[2] Mayser 245.
[3] Blass N.T. 19.
[4] Mayser 237.

and in nominal forms in -ι(ν), however, such as ποιοῦσι(ν), Μακεδόσι(ν), omission is also allowed: well-attested instances in the LXX of its omission are πᾶσι τούτοις 2 Es. xix. 38 BℵA, Jdth. xiv. 3 ἐγεροῦσι τοὺς...BℵA. Εἴκοσι never takes the ν ἐφελκ- in LXX or in Ptolemaic papyri. As regards the Hellenistic dative of δύο—δυσί(ν)—here the LXX MSS do on the whole insert or omit the ν according as the letter following is a vowel or a consonant: δυσίν is always (14 times) used before a vowel, δυσί is attested without v. l. before a consonant 12 times: on the other hand, δυσίν precedes a consonant without v. l. five times (Dt. xvii. 6, Jos. vi. 22 B, 3 K. xxii. 31 B, Is. vi. 2 *bis*), while in four passages δυσί and δυσίν appear as vll. before a consonant.

The vernacular language inserted an irrational final ν very freely (Mayser 197 ff.): so in LXX ℵ has διέλθατεν Jer. ii. 10, cf. ἐμέν (=ἐμέ) Is. xxxvii. 35 ℵ. The latter form, like χείραν ὑγιῆν etc., may be partly due to assimilation to nouns of the 1st declension (see § 10, 12).

8. The Attic form ἕνεκα has been largely superseded by the Ionic and poet. ἕνεκεν (εἵνεκεν, limited in the best MSS to οὗ εἵνεκεν, except in Lam. iii. 44).

Ἕνεκα is not found before 2 K. xii. 21 B: it occurs in all only 37 times (15 in Ψ), including variants, out of 141 examples of the preposition. It is probably the original form in 3 K. (2), Prov. (1), 2 M. (4): 1 Es., Ψ, Sir., Min. Proph., Ez. and Dan. O have both forms, the remaining books ἕνεκεν only.

The use of one form or the other is not governed by the fact that the following word begins with a vowel or a consonant (ἕνεκα ὀνόματος in 3 K. viii. 41 A): but in the first half of Ψ (to lxviii. 19) the distinction seems to be made that ἕνεκεν τοῦ is written, but ἕνεκα τῶν (to avoid the triple ν)[1].

Εἶτεν, ἔπειτεν are not found.

[1] Ἕνεκα τῶν Ψ v. 9, viii. 3, xxvi. 11, xlvii. 12 B, lxviii. 19: ἕνεκεν τοῦ vi. 5, xxii. 3, xxx. 4, xliii. 27.

9. The **final s** of οὕτω(ς) is likewise inserted on preponderant authority of the LXX MSS, as in the papyri, before both consonants and vowels. Οὕτω is strongly attested only in Lev. vi. 37 (BAF before καί), x. 13 (BAF before γάρ), Dt. xxxii. 6 (BA before λαός), 1 K. xxviii. 2 (BA before νῦν), Job xxvii. 2 BℵC (before με), Is. xxx. 15 (Bℵ before λέγει). Elsewhere οὕτω receives occasional support from single MSS, especially ℵ, which uses this form fairly consistently in Est. (six out of seven times), 4 M. and the latter part of Isaiah (from xlix. 25).

Μέχρι and ἄχρι are usually so written, as in Attic, without final s, even before a vowel. Μέχρις οὗ, however, is well attested in Est. D 8 (BℵA), Jdth. v. 10 (Bℵ), Tob. xi. 1 (BA), 1 Es. vi. 6 (B), Dan. Θ xi. 36 (AQ: μέχρις τοῦ B*); μέχρι οὗ, on the other hand, is read by B*AF in Jos. iv. 23, cf. 1 Es. i. 54 B*, Jdth. xii. 9 B*A, Tob. v. 7 ℵ (μέχρι ὅτου), and ἄχρι οὗ in Job xxxii. 11 by BℵC (ἄχρις οὗ A). Apart from this phrase the (Epic and late) forms ἄχρις μέχρις are confined to Jd. xi. 33 B ἄχρις Ἀρνών, Job ii. 9 A μέχρις τίνος. Ἀντικρυς...αὐτοῦ 3 M. v. 16 = "opposite" is a late usage: Attic uses (κατ)αντικρύ in this sense.

The poetical ἑπτάκι is written before a consonant in Prov. xxiv. 16 Bℵ and in the B text of 3 K. xviii. 43 f. *ter*, 4 K. v. 14 (contrast 10 ἑπτάκις ἐν): elsewhere always ἑπτάκις ἑξάκις πεντάκις ποσάκις.

10. **Elision.** Elision, owing to the prevailing tendency to isolate and give a distinct individuality to each word is the exception, and is in most books of the LXX confined to prepositions (and particles), though even with these the *scriptio plena* is more common. The few rules that are observable in the MSS of the N.T. apply also to those of the LXX.

(1) *Proper names* in particular are kept distinct and apart: before them the prep. is nearly always written in full, e.g. 1 M. x. 4 μετὰ Ἀλεξάνδρου (but μετ' αὐτῶν, καθ' ἡμῶν in the

same verse): exceptions are ἐπ᾽ Αἴγυπτον Is. xxxvi. 6, κατ᾽ Αἴγυπτον 4 M. iv. 22, καθ᾽ Ἡλιόδωρον 2 M. iii. 40 A (κατά V).

(2) Elision of the final vowel of *prepositions* often takes place in combinations of frequent occurrence and before pronouns, e.g. ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς, ἀπ᾽ ἐχθές, κατ᾽ ἀνατολάς, ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ, μετ᾽ αὐτῶν, ἀντ᾽ αὐτ(οῦ)[1], ἀνθ᾽ ὧν. Elsewhere, the *scriptio plena* of the prep. is the rule even where an aspirate follows, e.g. N. xv. 20 ἀπὸ ἅλω (ἅλωνος), W. ix. 17 ἀπὸ ὑψίστων: we find even (with pronoun following) ἐπὶ ὧν N. iv. 49.

(3) Of *particles* ἀλλά and οὐδέ occasionally suffer elision, but are more commonly written in full. Ἵνα undergoes elision in Ex. ix. 14 B ἵν᾽ εἰδῇς (ἵνα A), Jos. iii. 4 B ἵν᾽ ἐπίστησθε (ἵνα AF): contrast Jos. xi. 20 ἵνα ἐξολεθρ. BAF.

(4) 4 Maccabees shows a more frequent and bolder use of elision. Not only does this book contain such examples as δι᾽ ἀνάγκην, δι᾽ ἔργων, δι᾽ εὐσέβειαν, καθ᾽ ἡλικίαν, κατ᾽ οὐδένα, κατ᾽ ἐνιαυτόν, κατ᾽ οὐρανόν, καθ᾽ ὑπερβολήν, ἀλλ᾽ οὐδέ, ἀλλ᾽ ὥσπερ, but it also has συμβουλεύσαιμ᾽ ἄν, μακαρίσαιμ᾽ ἄν and similar phrases (i. 1, 10, ii. 6, v. 6), τοῦθ᾽ ὅτι ii. 9 A (τοῦτο ὅτι ℵV), δ᾽ ἔστιν *ib.* A, δ᾽ ἄν vii. 17. Another literary book, 2 Macc., has τοῦτ᾽ ἐπιτελέσαι xiv. 29 V (no doubt the right reading: τοῦ ἐπιτ. A) and ποῦ ποτ᾽ ἐστίν xiv. 32. But even the literary and poetical books prefer the *scriptio plena* in combinations not involving a prep., e.g. πτῶμα ἄτιμον W. iv. 19, ἄνδρα ἀκάρδιον, Prov. x. 13 BA (ΑΝΔΡΑΚΑΡΔΙΟΝ ℵ)—one of the iambic endings that are so frequent in this book.

11. **Crasis**, again, is quite rare in LXX, and practically confined to some stereotyped combinations with καί. The only frequent example is κἀγώ which is attested in nearly every instance: καὶ ἐγώ has good authority only in 2 Ch. xviii. 7 (BA), Job xxxiii. 5 f. (BA, BℵA), Ez. (xxxiv. 31 BAQ, xxxvi. 28 AQ), and in the Minor Prophets. Κἀμέ is the reading of the uncials

[1] Jd. xv. 2 A (ἀντὶ αὐτ. B), 4 K. x. 35, 1 Ch. i. 44 etc., 1 M. ix. 30.

in Gen. xxvii. 34, 38, Ex. xii. 32 and 4 M. xi. 3 (so κἀμοῦ *ib.* v. 10) : κἀμοί is read by A in Jd. xiv. 16, by B in Job xii. 3. Κἄν for καὶ ἐάν is doubtless original in 4 M. x. 18, and is attested by B elsewhere (Lev. vii. 6, Sir. iii. 13, Is. viii. 14). Καὶ ἐκεῖ is usually and καὶ ἐκεῖθεν always written *plene*: κἀκεῖ is no doubt original in 3 M. vii. 19, is read by BA in R. i. 17, and also attested in 3 K. xix. 12 A, Is. xxvii. 10 Q, lvii. 7 ℵQ. Κἀκεῖν(ος) is certain in W. xviii. 1, Is. lvii. 6, 2 M. i. 15, and is read by AQ in Dan. Θ Sus. 57 (*ib.* Dan. O καὶ ἐκ. and so 3 K. iii. 21). The literary books 2 and 3 Macc. alone[1] contain examples of crasis with the definite article : τἀνδρός 2 M. xiv. 28, 31 V, τοὐναντίον 3 M. iii. 22, τἀληθές *ib.* vii. 12 : 4 Macc. always writes καλοκἀγαθία (but καλὸς καὶ ἀγαθός as in 2 M.) and it affords apparently the only example of crasis in compounds of προ-, προυφάνησαν iv. 10 Aℵ (προεφ. V).

ℵ* has ἐσταγαθόν for ἔσται ἀγ. in Prov. xiii. 13a : C writes ἡμαρτία in Job xxiv. 20 for ἡ ἁμαρτία.

12. **Hiatus** and the harsh juxtaposition of consonants at the close of one word and the beginning of the next were avoided by followers of the rules of Isocrates by the use of some alternative forms. Πᾶς and ἅπας, ὅτι and διότι are the chief examples. In the LXX, as in the Ptolemaic papyri[2], the employment of ἅπας appears to be due in most books to regard for euphony, whereas διότι is used indiscriminately after vowels and consonants.

The LXX always writes (εἰς) τὸν ἅπαντα (not πάντα) χρόνον : Dt. xxii. 19, 29 : 1 Es. viii. 82 : Est. E 24, ix. 28 : 1 M. x. 30, xi. 36, xv. 8. Only in the following passages do the uncials unite in attesting ἅπας after a vowel : 2 K. iii. 25 γνῶναι ἅπαντα, 1 Ch. xvii. 10 ἐταπείνωσα ἅπαντας BℵA (cf. xvi. 43 Bℵ), 1 Es. viii.

[1] Apart from τοὐνιαυτοῦ Ex. xxxiv. 23 A*. The papyri show a fair number of examples of crasis with the article, τἄλλα τἀντίγραφον etc., but *scriptio plena* is the rule, Mayser 158.

[2] Mayser 161 f.

63 (after a pause), 2 M. iv. 16 *καθ' ὃ ἅπαν* AV, 3 M. v. 2 *ἀκράτῳ ἅπαντας*: elsewhere there is always a v. l. *πᾶς*.

Διότι occurs altogether in 358 instances, of which 201 are after a vowel, 157 after a consonant. With the meaning "because" (300 examples) the number of examples following a vowel and a consonant are about equal: with the meaning "that" the word is used with greater regard to euphony, there being only 10 examples following a consonant.

Out of the 358 examples of *διότι* 250 are found in the Minor Prophets (145), Ezekiel *α* (75) and Jeremiah *α* (30), a fact which illustrates the close connexion existing between these portions of the LXX. Jer. *β* has only three examples, two of which are incorrect readings (xxx. 1 ℵ, xxxi. 44 A, xxxvii. 6): Ez. *β* has four (in three of which other readings are preferable). Ez. *α* writes *ἐπιγνώσονται διότι ἐγὼ Κύριος* where Ez. *β* has *γνώσονται ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι Κύριος*.

ACCIDENCE.

§ 10. Declensions of the Noun.

1. Assimilation is here seen at work. There is a tendency to obliterate distinctions within each declension and between the several declensions. In particular we note some signs of the movement in the direction of the absorption of the consonantal (third) declension in the α and ο (first and second) declensions.

2. **First declension.** *Nouns in α pure.* The Attic rule that nouns ending in α pure (*-ρα -ια -εα*) keep α in the gen. and dat. sing. undergoes modification in the *κοινή* in two classes of words, which it will be well to keep distinct: (1) nouns and perfect participles in *-νια* (*-νῖα*), (2) nouns in *-ρᾰ́*. These now tend to have gen. and dat. sing. in *-ης -ῃ* like the majority of fem. words in Declension I. Nouns in *-ειᾰ́* etc. and in *-ρᾱ́* are unaffected: *ἀληθείας -είᾳ, ἡμέρας -ρᾳ* are written as before.

The LXX exx. of (1) are *κυνομυίης* Ex. viii. 21 B, 24 B, *τετελευτηκυίῃ* L. xxi. 11 B, N. vi. 6 B, *ἐπιβεβηκυίης* 1 K. xxv. 20 B (A *-κύεις* = *-κύης* = *-κυίης*), *ἐαλωκυίης* Is. xxx. 13 ℵ, *ἑστηκυιηστήλη* (= *ἑστηκυίης στήλη*, § 9, 1) *ἁλός* W. x. 7 ℵ*. Only in the passage in 1 K. is the *η* form attested by more than one of the uncials: elsewhere the MSS have the usual forms, e.g. *ἐξεληλυθυίας* L. xxvii. 21.

(2) The exx. of the *η* forms with nouns in *-ρᾰ́* are also quite in a minority, so far, at least, as the only word which occurs

repeatedly is concerned. Out of 79 exx. of the use of μάχαιρα in gen. or dat. sing. in LXX there are only 2 where the η forms are universally supported and certainly original. These are μαχαίρῃ Gen. xxvii. 40 A*D*E (no witness to -ρᾳ in the larger Cambridge LXX), Ex. xv. 9 B*AF: both passages, it is important to note, are poetical—the blessing pronounced upon Esau and the song after the crossing of the Red Sea. The η forms with μάχαιρα occur also in Gen. xlviii. 22 A*D* (-ρᾳ BF) and in a single uncial in the following: in E Gen. xxxiv. 26, in B* N. xxi. 24, 2 K. xv. 14, in A Dt. xiii. 15, Jos. xix. 47, Bel Θ 26 and 11 times in the A text of Jeremiah (in both parts)[1].—Σφῦρα has dat. σφύρῃ Is. xli. 7, gen. σφύρης, Sir. xxxviii. 28 (cf. ὁλοσφύρητος Sir. l. 9 with Rutherford *NP* p. 286). 2 Macc. yields 3 exx.: σπείρης viii. 23, xii. 22, παλαίστρῃ iv. 14.

As to the origin of these forms, they cannot be entirely due to mere assimilation to δόξης -ῃ: for why should participles in -κνῖᾶ have the η forms, while ἀλήθειᾶ retains the α forms?

The forms -νίης -νίῃ owe their existence, no doubt, as Blass says[2], to the non-pronunciation of the ι in the diphthong νι, which produced such spellings as παρειληφῦα, ὑός in Attic Inscriptions of iv/B.C. and earlier[3]. Though the older spelling again revived in the Hellenistic period, the declension -νίης -νίῃ maintained its place and is very common in papyri of the early Empire.

As to the forms -ρης -ρῃ there is a division of opinion. They are explained by the majority of critics[4] as due to analogy with other nouns in α, e.g. δόξα δόξης, while others[5] are convinced that they are the result of Ionic influence upon the κοινή. The probability is that both influences have been at work, and that the η forms were *originally* Ionic survivals, specially frequent with words having Ionic associations: afterwards analogy came into play (the η forms only became common in the *later* κοινή) and extended their use to all words in -ρᾰ[6].

[1] As against 11 exx. of the α forms in the A text of Jer.: the other uncials have the α forms throughout the book.
[2] N.T. p. 25. Cf. ἐπιβεβηκύεις = -κύης in 1 K. loc. cit. A.
[3] Meisterhans 59 f.
[4] So Blass, J. H. Moulton, Mayser.
[5] So Thumb *Hell.* 68 ff., Schwyzer *Perg.* 40 ff., W.-S. 80 f.
[6] Cf. modern Greek ἐλεύτερος fem. ἐλεύτερη.

(i) This is suggested by the piece of LXX evidence given above. It is most remarkable that the two passages in LXX where *μαχαίρῃ* is certainly original are poetical sections. The Pentateuch translators, according to their usual practice[1], adapted their language to their subject-matter and, writing at a time when the papyri show that the *α* forms were still the rule in prose, appear to have consciously selected the *η* form as an Ionism and therefore appropriate in these poetical passages.

(ii) It is further to be observed that the two words which most commonly take the *η* forms in the papyri of the early Empire have Ionic associations. The use of *ἄρουρα* for *γῆ* was an old Ionism taken over by the Tragedians (Rutherford *NP* 14): one of the uses of *σπεῖρα* was of the mouldings on an Ionic column (LS).

(iii) The contrast between the LXX and the N.T. is instructive and indicates the value of the uncial evidence. Whereas we have seen that in the LXX *μαχαίρας -ρᾳ* are normal and there are only 2 undisputed exx. of the *η* forms out of 79, in the N.T. *μαχαίρης -ρῃ* are read by WH in all the 8 passages where the cases occur: an almost exclusive use of the *η* forms is found in the other N.T. words in *-ρᾰ* (WH ed. 2 App. 163).

(iv) This distinction between O.T. and N.T. is borne out by the papyri, which show that it is one of time, not of country (Egypt and Palestine). The *η* forms are absent from papyri of iii/B.C.: exx. with words in *-ρᾰ* begin at the close of ii/B.C. with *ὀλύρης* (118 B.C.), *μαχαίρης -ρηι* (114 and 112 B.C.)[2]. On the other hand under the early Empire these forms are practically universal[3].

3. Κόρη[4] (originally *κόρϝη*) was one of two words (with *δέρη*) where Attic prose retained *η* in the nom. after *ρ*. It is not surprising to find the word brought into line with others in *-ρᾱ*: there is evidence for the form *κόραν* in all 3 passages in LXX where the acc. appears, Dt. xxxii. 10 B*F, Ψ xvi. 8 B*א*, Sir.

[1] Thiersch 61.

[2] Mayser 12 f.

[3] I have noted upwards of 30 exx. of *ἀρούρης* between 67 A.D. (BU 379) and vii/A.D. (BU 319), about a dozen of *σπείρης* in ii/A.D. alone. *Σπίρας* gen. occurs in BM ii. 256 (early i/A.D.). Apart from the last ex. the cases of these two words do not seem to occur in the earlier papyri: we should expect to find the *η* forms, if, as appears, the words are Ionic in their origin: a recrudescence of a dialectical peculiarity at a late stage in the language would be unnatural.—The forms *-νίης* etc. begin with *καθηκνίης* (=*καθηκούσης*) in 161 B.C. (BM i. 41. 5): *εἰδνίης* is common under the Empire.

[4] See J. H. Moulton *Prol.* ed. 2, 244.

xvii. 22 ℵ (*-ρην* BAC): the Attic gen. *κόρης* stands, however, in Zech. ii. 8.

4. In proper names, as previously in Attic Greek, *α* impure replaces *η* in gen. and dat.: *Ἄννᾳ* 1 K. i. 2, *Ἄννας* Tob. i. 20, *Φεννάνᾳ* 1 K. i. 2, 4, *Σουσάννας* Dan. O Sus. 30, Dan. Θ Sus. 27 AQ (*-άννης* B), 28 B^{ab}AQ (*-άννης* B*), 63 AQΓ.

5. *Τόλμην* as from *τόλμη* (not *τόλμᾰ*) stands in Jdth xvi. 10 A (*-μαν* Bℵ): cf. the fluctuation between *πρύμνα πρύμνη* etc. in Attic poetry. Conversely *κολόκυνθα* (*-κυντα* AQ) acc. *-θαν* replaces Attic *κολοκύντη* (Rutherford *NP* p. 498) in the *κοινή*: Jon. iv. 7.

6. The (Doric) gen. plur. *ψυχᾶν* occurs as a v. l. of ℵ* in W. ii. 22.

The rare plural forms of *γῆ*[1] occur in the B text of 4 K.: *τὰς γᾶς* xviii. 35, *ταῖς γαῖς* xix. 11. Elsewhere the Heb. ארצות is rendered by *χῶραι* or by the poetical *γαῖαι* (4 K locc. citt. A text, 2 Es. 4 times, Ez. xxxvi. 24, Ψ xlviii. 12) or the plur. is replaced by the sg. (e.g. Gen. xli. 54 *ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ*, Jer. xxxv. 8 *ἐπὶ γῆς πολλῆς*, Dan. Θ xi. 42).

7. The contracted form *βορρᾶς*, which already in Attic Greek was an alternative for *βορέας*[2], was used almost exclusively in the *κοινή*. It is the normal form in papyri[3] and LXX: *βορέας -έου -έαν* is confined to the literary version of Proverbs (xxv. 23, xxvii. 16: corrected in later hands of B to *βορρέας*), Sirach (xliii. 17, 20: in 20 B has *βορέης*) and Job Θ xxvi. 7. Elsewhere gen. *βορρᾶ*, dat. *βορρᾷ*, acc. *βορρᾶν*, voc. *βορρᾶ* (Cant. iv. 16).

ℵ sometimes appends an irrational *ν* to the gen. *ἀπὸ* (*γῆς*) *βορρᾶν*, *ἐκ τοῦ βορρᾶν* etc., Is. xlix. 12 (*ἀπὸ βορᾶν*: Mayser 213), Jer. iii. 18, xiii. 20, xvi. 15, xxiii. 8, xxv. 9, xxvii. 9, 41, xxix. 2,

[1] LS cite Aristotle for *γαῖ*, Strabo for *γᾶς*: *γᾶς* and *γῶν* occur in papyri of ii/B.C. (Teb. 6. 31, BU 993. 3, TP 1. 2.)

[2] Meisterhans 100. The change seems to have begun with *βορρᾶθεν*, which first appears c. 400 B.C.

[3] Always in the Ptolemaic papyri, Mayser 252, 221. *Βορέας* seems to have been partially reinstated later: an ex. from i/A.D. is cited by Thumb *Hell.* 65.

Zech. vi. 6, cf. Ez. xlvii. 17 Q: while the *ν* is dropped in the acc. in Dan. Θ viii. 4 B (*κατὰ θάλασσαν καὶ βορρᾶ καὶ νότον*) and elsewhere in Q.

For gen. *-α* or *-ου* in proper names in *-ας* see § 11, 4 f.

8. **Second declension.** The *κοινή*, or some portions of it[1], used the *uncontracted* as well as the Attic *contracted forms.* In the LXX there is a curious distinction in one word. The rule as regards *ὀστέον ὀστοῦν* in LXX is that the contracted forms are used in the nom. and acc., the uncontracted in the gen. and dat.: *ὀστοῦν ὀστᾶ* but *ὀστέου ὀστέων ὀστέοις.* See e.g. Gen. ii. 23 *Τοῦτο νῦν ὀστοῦν ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων μου*, Ez. xxxvii. 1 *ὀστέων* (*-των* Q), 3 f. *ὀστᾶ* (*ter*), 5 *ὀστέοις* (*-τοις* Q), 7 and 11 (*bis*) *ὀστᾶ.*

Ὀστῶν Ez. xxxii. 27 breaks the rule: there are also variant readings *ὀστέα* in Ψ l. 10 T𝔑^{ca}, Lam. iii. 4 BQ, iv. 8 B, *ὀστῶν* Job Θ xxxiii. 19 B𝔑, *ὀστοῖς* Jer. xx. 9 B.

On the other hand the contracted forms only of *κάνεον* are used: *κανοῦν κανοῦ κανῷ* plur. *κανᾶ* (Pent. and Jd. vi. 19 A).

Χειμάρρους *-ουν* is still so written: the later *χείμαρρος* is confined in LXX to Ψ cxxiii. 4 and to vll. in N. xxxiv. 5 (A), Jer. xxix. 2 (𝔑*).

(Ἀρχι)οινοχόος, *χρυσοχόος* are uncontracted as also in Attic Greek: the papyri have the contracted forms as well[2].

For *νοῦς νοός*, *χοῦς χοός* etc. see § 10, 31: for contracted adjectives § 12, 2.

9. The so-called **Attic second declension** for the most part disappears from the *κοινή*, words in *-ως* being transformed or replaced by new words. Excepting one word (*ἅλως*) the forms in *-ως* in LXX are confined to the literary books. The old *ἅλως* and the new *ἅλων -ωνος* (already attested in Aristot.) appear side by side in the LXX, the new form prevailing[3]. Ἅλως appears only in the form αλω which does

[1] Thumb *Hell.* 63 says they are specially characteristic of the Eastern *κοινή* and regards them as of Ionic origin.

[2] Mayser 258.

[3] The uncials (Camb. Manual LXX) have forms from *ἅλως* without v. l.

duty not only for gen. dat. and acc. sing. (not ἄλων), but also for acc. plur., τοὺς ἄλω 1 K. xxiii. 1 BA: this form of the acc. plur., due to the weak sound of final ς, is attested in papyri of ii/B.C. and in MSS of Josephus (*A.J.* vi. 272)[1]. The preponderance of the forms from ἄλων in the LXX is remarkable, as the Ptolemaic papyri only yield one example (ἀλώνωι = ἀλώνων 118 B.C.) as against numerous examples of the other forms[2]. The gender as well as the form is variable, B on the whole preferring the masc. and A the fem.

Ἔως appears only in 3 M. v. 46. Κάλως "rope" is replaced by κάλος N. iii. 37, iv. 32 (A κλάδους *bis*), λεώς by λαός throughout, and νεώς by ναός except in 2 M., which, beside ναός, has nom. νεώς x. 5, gen. νεώ iv. 14, acc. νεώ A (νεών V) vi. 2, ix. 16, x. 3, xiii. 23, xiv. 33. Λαγώς is replaced by δασύπους (Aristot.).

For adjectives in -ως see § 12, 3.

10. The vocative of θεός is the unclassical θεέ, even in the literary books (Jd. xvi. 28 B, xxi. 3 B: 2 K. vii. 25 B: Sir. xxiii. 4: 3 M. vi. 2, 4 M. vi. 27) as in N.T. (Mt. xxvii. 46). The class. voc. θεός occurs in N. xvi. 22 BA (θεὲ θεέ F). More often, however, the voc. is expressed by ὁ θεός (see Syntax).

11. *Gender in Declension II.*

The tendency towards uniformity shows itself in the occasional transference of some feminine words in Decl. II. into the larger class of masculines. Ὁ ἄμπελος Hb. iii. 17 ℵ, ὁ βάσανος 1 M. ix. 56 ℵ, ὁ ῥάβδος Gen. xxx. 37 A, are vagaries of a single MS: the classical fem. is kept elsewhere. Ὁ βάτος of LXX (Ex. iii. 2 ff.: Dt. xxxiii. 16) appears to be vulgar and Hellenistic (Aristoph., Theophr.). Ὁ ληνός has the support

in 13 passages, from ἄλων without v. l. in 24: in 6 passages the two forms are attested by different MSS. The -ως forms occur in Numbers, Ruth, 1—3 K., 1—2 Ch., Hg. ii. 19.

[1] Mayser 259, 207.

[2] Ib. 287, 258 f.

of a group of cursives in Gen. xxx. 38, 41: the uncials here and elsewhere keep the fem. Ὁ λίθος, as in N.T., is used in all senses, including that of precious stones, where Attic writers often used ἡ. Ὁ στάμνος Ex. xvi. 33 is 'Doric[1].' Ὁ λιμός, the older Attic gender, is usual in LXX: the 'Doric' ἡ (Rutherford *NP* p. 274) is read by all uncials in Is. viii. 21, by B in 3 K. xviii. 2, and by A in Jer. xvii. 18, xxiv. 10, 1 M. ix. 24, xiii. 49. Ἡ (usual in Attic) and ὁ τρίβος (already in Euripides) are both found, sometimes in the same book, the former slightly preponderating[2]. The gender of the probably Semitic ὕσσωπος also fluctuates: it is masc. in Lev. xiv. 6, 51 f. in B*A, fem. ibid. in F (B^{ab}) and in 3 K. iv. 29 BA.

Ἀνεβιβάσθη ἡ βάτραχος Ex. viii. 6 A (ὁ β. B) is no doubt due to the collective use of the noun as in (classical) ἡ ἵππος = "cavalry," Gen. xiv. 11 etc.

12. Third declension.

Accusative sing. in -αν for -α. The assimilation of accusatives of the 3rd decl. ending in a vowel to those of the 1st decl. by the addition of final ν had begun as early as iv/B.C. in the case of a few proper names and appellatives in -ης (Σωκράτην, τριήρην etc.)[3]. The addition of ν to accusatives in -α did not come till later: it begins in the Egyptian papyri in ii/B.C.[4] and does not become common before ii/A.D. It is always a vulgarism, and is connected with a wider tendency, specially common in Egypt, to append an irrational ν to other cases of the noun and to other parts of speech[5]. The LXX examples are

[1] The N.T. in the single passage in Hebrews keeps Attic ἡ.

[2] Ὁ is attested in 1 K. vi. 12, 1 Ch. xxvi. 18, Ψ xliii. 19, cxviii. 35 ℵ (elsewhere ἡ in this book), Prov. iii. 17 (do.), Jer. xviii. 15 (do.), Jl. ii. 7 A and in one or more of the uncials in Is. iii. 12, xxx. 11, xlii. 16, xlix. 9, 11, lviii. 12.

[3] Jannaris p. 542. His list of LXX exx. of accusatives in -αν needs checking.

[4] Χίραν in a letter of 160 B.C. and τρίποδαν in i/B.C. are the only examples in the Ptolemaic age quoted by Mayser 199.

[5] Ib. 197 ff.

practically confined in the uncials to the two MSS A and ℵ, where they probably represent the Egyptian spelling of a later age than the autographs.

The examples noted in A are Ex. x. 4 *ἀκρίδαν*, xiii. 21 *νύκταν*, N. xv. 27 *αἶγαν*: R. iv. 11 *γυναῖκαν*: in 1 K. *νύκταν θώρακαν χεῖραν γυναῖκαν μερίδαν*: in 2 K. ii. 29, iv. 7 *νύκταν*, v. 18 *κοιλάδαν*, xiii. 10 *κοιτῶναν*: 3 K. i. 45 *βασιλέαν*: 4 K. xxii. 3 and 2 Ch. xxxiv. 15 *γραμματαίαν*, 2 Ch. xxxiv. 9 *ἱερέαν*: 1 Es. iv. 19 *πρᾶγμαν*, viii. 8 *ἱερέαν*: Ψ xxviii. 7 *φλόγαν*: Is. vii. 19 *ῥαγάδαν*: Jdth xiii. 10 *φάραγγαν*: Sir. xiii. 6 *ἐλπίδαν*: 1 M. x. 1 *Πτολεμαΐδαν*. In ℵ these forms are exceedingly common in the Prophetical books (*αἰῶναν* and *χεῖραν* furnish the majority of instances): cf. the pronominal forms in ℵ *τίναν* Na. iii. 19, *ἐμέν* Is. xxxvii. 35. In B, on the other hand, the only exx. noted are Is. xxxvi. 2 *βασιλέαν*, xxxvii. 29 *ῥ(ε)ῖναν* (with ℵ)[1], Zeph. i. 4 *χεῖραν*.

Cf. § 12, 5 for adjectives.

13. *Accusative plural.* The old termination of the acc. plur. of stems in *υ* (*ου*)—viz. ς unpreceded by α (e.g. *τὰς βοῦς*)—is replaced in Hellenistic Greek by *-ας*, possibly to prevent confusion with the nom. sing. So in LXX *βόας* always, 29 times[2]: *ἰχθύας* 8 times with *ἰχθῦς* twice as a v.l., Ez. xxix. 4 B (contrast 5), Hb. i. 14 ℵ (*ἰχθῦς*): *μύας* 1 K. vi. 1, 4 A, but *μῦς* vi. 5, 11 (similar variety in the nom.: *μύες* v. 6 but *μῦς* vi. 18): *ὀσφύας* 10 times (including L. xiv. 9 B) with v.l. *ὀσφῦς* in Is. xxxii. 11 B*: *ὀφρύας* L. xiv. 9 A (*ὀφρῦς* B^{ab}F): *στάχυας*[3] Gen. xli. 7, 24, Jd. xv. 5 A, but *στάχυς* Ex. xxii. 6, Dt. xxiii. 24.

14. The assimilation of the acc. to the nom. plur. in words in *-εύς* (on the model of *αἱ* and *τὰς πόλεις*) begins in Attic Inscriptions as early as c. 300 B.C.[4] The LXX accord-

[1] Cod. B in the central chapters of Isaiah has other instances of Egyptian or vulgar spellings not found elsewhere in the MS: *κραυῆς* xxx. 19 (=*κραυγῆς*, § 7, 30), *προσήξει* (for *-έξει*) xxxii. 4, *ἥκει* (for *ἐκεῖ*) xxxiii. 6.

[2] The only ex. of the acc. pl. in Ptolemaic papyri is in the Attic form *τὰς βοῦς* (iii/B.C.), Mayser 268. Papyri of the Imperial age have *βόας*: OP iv. 729 (137 A.D.), GP 48 (346 A.D.).

[3] Ptolemaic papyri have one ex. of *στάχυς*, none of *-υας*, Mayser 267.

[4] Meisterhans 141.

ingly has τοὺς βασιλεῖς, γονεῖς, ἱερεῖς, ἱππεῖς etc. The older form βασιλέας occurs in 4 K. vii. 6 *bis* BA [contrast iii. 10, 13] and as a v.l. in 2 Es. xix. 22 B, Jer. xxxii. 12 ℵ, Hos. vii. 3 Q. Γονέας 4 M. ii. 10 V may have been written by the Atticizing author of that book.

15. *Assimilation of acc. to nom. plur.* occurs also in the substitution of -ες *for* -ας. This seems to have begun with the numeral τέσσαρες and then to have been extended to other words. Dr J. H. Moulton has acutely suggested a reason for the special tendency to equate the nom. and acc. of τέσσαρες, viz. that this is (excepting εἷς) "the only early cardinal which ever had a separate acc. form[1]."

> In the papyri[2] τέσσαρες (acc.) furnishes most of the examples. I have counted 49 exx., of which 8 are B.C. and 41 between i/ and ii/A.D.: from i/A.D. it is more frequent than τέσσαρας which is still in use. Next comes πάντες (9 exx.), then participles in -ντες: exx. like γυναῖκες occur sporadically. Two exx. are as early as iii/B.C., the first being τέσσαρες HP 90, 15: in the other the -ες has been corrected to -ας, πάντ]ᾶς τούς ap. Mayser 59.

In the LXX, as in the papyri, the commonest instance is τέσσαρες which is normal in B* (Ex. xxv. 11, 25 *bis* [A *semel*], 34 etc.) and frequent in A[3]. The -ες form appears also, but far less frequently, in another numeral. As against upwards of 100 examples of χιλιάδας (without v.l.) the acc. is written as -δες in 1 Es. i. 7 A, Jdth ii. 5 ℵ, Is. xxxvii. 36 ℵ = || 1 M. vii. 41 A[4]. (Μυριάδας is constant.)

[1] *Prol.* (ed. 2) 243. A possible contributory cause has been suggested elsewhere (§ 6, 2).

[2] Mayser 59, Moulton *CR* xv. 34, xviii. 108.

[3] The statistics for the uncials are as follows. B has 27 exx. of τέσσαρες to 13 of τέσσαρας: A 22 -ρες, 26 -ρας: ℵ 3 -ρες, 2 -ρας. The evidence of B cannot be quoted in N. xxix. 13 ff. where it writes ιδ', but -ρες ib. 29 shows how the symbol should be read. The statistics include Jos. xxi. 18 ff., where πόλεις τέσσαρες of BA should perhaps be taken as a new sentence (cf. 39) and not in apposition with the preceding accusatives.

[4] Also perhaps in 3 K. viii. 63 B = || 2 Ch. vii. 5 B, 3 K. xii. 21 BA = 2 Ch. xi. 1 B, 1 Ch. xviii. 12 A, Ez. xlv. 5 *bis* (AQ, BAQ). But these passages

Apart from these two numerals the LXX instances of acc. in -ες are quite rare: it is noteworthy that two of them occur in connexion with *τέσσαρες*. 1 Ch. xxv. 5 A *καὶ ἔδωκεν θεὸς τῷ Ἀ. υἱοὺς δέκα τέσσαρες καὶ θυγάτερες τρ(ε)ῖς*: 2 Ch. xxiii. 2 B *συνήγαγεν τοὺς Λευείτας...καὶ ἄρχοντες*: Zech. i. 20 ℵ *ἔδειξέν μοι Κύριος τέσσαρες τέκτονες*[1]. The B text of 2 Es. xxiii. 15 *εἶδον ἐν Ἰούδᾳ πατοῦντας...καὶ φέροντες...καὶ ἐπιγεμίζοντες...καὶ φέροντες* *may* be merely an instance of "drifting into the nominative[2]," but the papyri show that this form of acc. was common in participles.

The converse use of *-ας* for *-ες* in the nom. plur. occurs in 4 K. xiii. 7 A *χιλιάδας*, 1 Ch. xii. 36 A *χιλιάδας*, 2 Es. xvi. 9 ℵ *χεῖρας*.

16. *Relation of the nominative to the cases* (inflection with or without consonant). The inflection *κέρας κέρως* dat. *κέρᾳ* has disappeared, the cases being formed with *τ*: dat. *κέρατι* (Is. v. 1: Dan. O Θ vii. 8), plur. *κέρατα κεράτων*. Κρέας, on the other hand, which is used mainly in the plural, keeps the shorter forms *κρέα κρεῶν*[3]. Γῆρας in Attic is declined like *κέρας, γήρως γήρᾳ*: in LXX the anomalous dat. is replaced by *γήρει* (Gen. xv. 15 etc., 1 Ch. xxix. 28, Ψ xci. 15, Dan. O vi. 1), except in Sirach which has *γήρᾳ* (iii. 12, viii. 6 ℵA, xxv. 3): the gen. keeps the classical form *γήρως* in the literary books (W. iv. 9, 2—4 Macc.) and Gen. xliv. 20, elsewhere *γήρους* has undisputed (Gen. xxxvii. 3, Sir. xlvi. 9) or good authority (Gen. xlviii. 10 B: 3 K. xi. 3 B [xiv. 4 A = Aquila], xv. 23 A:

may be merely instances of "drifting into the nominative" and of the tendency to place a numerical statement in a parenthesis. This is clearly the case in 3 K. v. 14 B *καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν Λίβανον—δέκα χιλιάδες ἐν τῷ μηνί, ἀλλασσομένοι*. In Jd. vii. 3 B *εἴκοσι καὶ δύο χιλιάδες* is subject, not object.

[1] In Dt. ii. 25 B* *ταραχθήσονται καὶ ὠδῖνες* (*-νας* B^{b}AF) *ἔξουσιν, ὠδῖνες* is apparently the subject: cf. Job xxi. 17, Is. xiii. 8.

[2] Cf. BM ii. 154. 14 (68 A.D.) *μηδὲ τοὺς παρ' αὐτοῦ κυριεύοντα[ς αὐτῶν] καὶ εἰσοδεύοντας καὶ ἐξοδεύοντας καὶ κατασπῶντες*.

[3] Ex. xxix. 14 "*κρεατα* F" Swete: the MS, I learn from Mr Brooke, has *κερατα*. Κρέατος once in an Attic inscription of iv/B.C., Meist. 143.

Ψ lxx. 9 BR, 18 B*אR: Is. xlvi. 4 א*A). Πέρας, τέρας keep τ in the cases, as in Attic.

17. Κλείς has acc. sing. κλεῖδα Jd. iii. 25 BA (and in a Hexaplaric insertion in Is. xxii. 22 κλίδα(ν) Aא) and acc. plur. κλεῖδας Dan. O Bel 11: the usual Attic forms κλεῖν, κλεῖς do not occur[1]. Χάρις keeps the classical χάριν throughout except twice in Zech. (iv. 7, vi. 14) where χάριτα is used: the latter (which has some classical authority: it appears to be Ionic and poetical) is absent from the papyri before the Roman period[2]. Γέλωτα is the only acc. known to LXX (Attic also used γέλων in poetry).

According to Moeris κλεῖν χάριν γέλων are Attic, κλεῖδα χάριτα γέλωτα Hellenic.

Θερμαστρίς -ίδος has acc. θερμάστρ(ε)ις 3 K. vii. 31 BA: ib. vii. 35 B has τὰς ἐπαρύστριs, A τὰς ἐπαρυστρίδας.

18. Egyptian (Ionic) words in -ις are declined like πόλις: βᾶρις (§ 4, p. 34) dat. βάρει[3], plur. βάρεις βάρεων βάρεσιν: θῖβις (ib.) θίβιν θίβει Ex. ii. 3, 5, 6 (θείβην is probably merely an itacism and not from θίβη LS): (ε)ἶβις -βιν, nom. plur. (ε)ἴβ(ε)ις Is. xxxiv. 11.

The plural of ἔρις is not used: in Ψ cxxxviii. 20 read ἐρεῖς. ΑΝΟΡΑC 1 K. viii. 22 A may be a mere slip for ΑΝΔΡΑC or a relic of the Epic ΑΝΕΡΑC.

19. Διῶρυξ has gen. -υχος etc. in Attic writers, -υγος etc. in Hellenistic writers from Polybius onward and throughout the Ptolemaic papyri[4] and so in LXX (Ex. vii. 19, viii. 5, Jer.

[1] But they are found in N.T. (Ap.) and the papyri.

[2] Mayser 271 f., Crönert 170 n. 6: but χάριτας once at end of ii/B.C. (Mayser).

[3] So in a papyrus of ii/B.C. (Mayser 266). Literary writers (Euripides, Plutarch) have the consonantal inflection βάριδι βάριδας (*Iph. in A.* 297). Hdt. has βᾶρις, βᾶριν, βάρισι (ii. 179). He also writes gen. ἴβιος, plur. ἴβιες, τὰς ἴβις (ii. 75 f.): LS cite ἴβιδος ἴβεως from Aelian.

[4] Mayser 18: the classical forms reappear in the papyri at the end of ii/A.D.: the B text in Isaiah is therefore open to suspicion.

xxxviii. 9): the classical forms appear in the B text of Isaiah (xix. 6, xxvii. 12, xxxiii. 21).

20. *Assimilation of the nominative to the cases* appears in ἡ ὠδίν Is. xxxvii. 3 (so N.T.). (The cases only of the class. nominatives ἀκτίς, ῥίς are used in LXX: in the papyri forms like ὀξύρριν abound.) Conversely, the consonant or the vowel of the nom. is retained in the dative plural: ἐλέφανσιν 1 M. i. 17 A (-ασιν ℵ*, with metaplasmus ἐλεφάντοις V), vi. 34 A (-ασιν ℵV): χειρσίν 1 Ch. v. 10 B[1]. It may be a merely orthographical matter that the long vowel of the nom. ἀλώπηξ is retained in the cases in Jd. i. 35 B (-πηκες), xv. 4 B (-πηκας), 3 K. xxi. 10 B[ab] (-πηξιν), Ez. xiii. 4 A (-πηκες). Cf. θυγατῆρος Sir. xxxvi. 26 ℵ[2]. Assimilation to σάλπιγξ etc. produces μάστιγξ 3 K. xii. 24r B, Sir. xxiii. 11 ℵ, μάστιγξιν 2 Ch. x. 11 B (§ 7, 33).

21. *Open and contracted forms.* As in the case of neuter words in -ον in the 2nd declension (8 *supra*), the κοινή preferred the (Ionic) uncontracted form of the gen. plur. in certain 3rd declension neuters in -ος[3]. So LXX always has ὀρέων and χειλέων, and usually τειχέων (τειχῶν 4 K. xxv. 4 A, Is. xxii. 11 B, lxii. 6 B, Dan. O iv. 26, 1 M. xvi. 23 ℵV). But ἐτῶν, σκευῶν are written, and in the other cases the contracted forms are retained: ὄρους ὄρη, τείχους τείχη, χείλους χείλη, πάχη etc.

Conversely, the gen. plur. of πῆχυς, in classical Greek πήχεων, in the κοινή, through assimilation to neuters in -ος, takes on a contracted form πηχῶν. So in the LXX in Judith, Esther and Ezekiel α (with occasional v.l. -εων in the last-named book): on the other hand in Genesis, Exodus and Chronicles[4] the classical πήχεων is retained: elsewhere the MS evidence is uncertain.

The gen. sing. in LXX is πήχεος (Ex. xxv. 9 etc.) corrected occasionally in A(F) to the classical πήχεως.

[1] So in "late inscriptions" (LS): cf. Epic χείρεσσι.
[2] LXX keeps θυγατρός etc. (not poet. θυγατέρος).
[3] Cf. Mayser 17, 277, Moulton *CR* xv. 435.
[4] Also (without variant) 1 K. xvii. 4, Zech. v. 2, Jer. lii. 21 f. (ib. 21 -χῶν BℵQ), Dan. Θ iii. 1 *bis* (=O -χῶν).

22. *Miscellaneous peculiar forms.*

Of τὸ ἄλας gen. ἄλατος (for ὁ ἅλς) the only fairly certain instance in LXX is Sir. xxxix. 26 ἅλας A (ἅλα cett.: as nominatives precede and follow A appears to preserve the true text): in other passages (L. ii. 13, Jd. ix. 45, 2 Es. vi. 9, Ez. xliii. 24 A) ἅλας may equally well be acc. plur. and is almost certainly so in the first of them (ἁλί, ἅλα in same verse). In the Ptolemaic papyri τὸ ἅλας appears as early as iii/B.C., but forms from ἅλς preponderate[1]: in the N.T. the new form has gained the ascendancy.

The oblique cases of ἀμνός—rare in classical Greek which uses ἄρνα ἀρνός etc. instead—in LXX are frequent, though the classical forms are still fairly well represented[2]. (In N.T. the only forms found are ἀμνός [nom.] and ἀρνίον.) The new fem. form ἀμνάς (Theocr. v. 3 with v.l. ἀμνίδες) usually renders the Heb. fem. כבשה (כשבה) "ewe-lamb."

Γόνα for γόνατα (3 K. viii. 54 A) may, if not a slip, be compared with Epic γοῦνα.

Ναῦς is on the way to becoming a literary word, πλοῖον supplanting it in most books of the LXX. Νῆας (= Att. ναῦς) occurs in 3 K. xxii. 49 A (a section apparently interpolated from Aquila) and the Epic. gen. νηός in Prov. xxiv. 54 νηὸς ποντοπορούσης BאA—naturally as the translator is imitating Homer (νεώς C, νηώς א$^{c.a}$): elsewhere the Attic forms ναῦν, νηί, νῆες 3 K. xxii. 49 A, ναυσί.

Ὄρνις, like ναῦς, makes way for a second declension form—

[1] Mayser 286, *Expositor*, Feb. 1908, v. 177.

[2] In the Pentateuch (or a portion of it) there is a curious differentiation in the use of the Hellenistic and the classical forms, based on a slight variation in spelling of the Hebrew. כֶּבֶשׂ, the ordinary word for "lamb," is constantly rendered by the forms from ἀμνός: in some dozen passages the radicals are transposed to כֶּשֶׂב, and in five of these (Gen. xxx. 32, 33, 35, L. i. 10, iii. 7) the forms of ἄρνα are used, ἀμνός only once (Gen. xxx. 40), elsewhere (L. iv. 35 etc.) πρόβατον. In Ex. xii. 5 כבשים read ἀμνῶν A (not ἀρνῶν B).

ὄρνεον (ὀρνίθιον)—being found only in 3 K. ii. 46^{e} = iv. 23 (ὀρνίθων ἐκλεκτῶν one of Solomon's delicacies).

Πέλεκυς is shortened to πέλυξ in Jer. xxiii. 29 BNQ (πέλυκυς A), Ez. ix. 2 (so once in Aquila).

Πληθύς (Epic) replaces πλῆθος in 3 M. iv. 17.

The contracted form στῆρ (for στέαρ) is limited to Theodotion (Bel 27): the LXX proper has στέαρ, φρέαρ in common with the papyri (Mayser 273)[1].

Συγγενής has dat. plur. συγγενεῦσι in 1 M. x. 89 A (-νέσι[ν] ℵ*V) as from συγγενεύς[2].

23. **Metaplasmus.**

We may group under this general head further instances of the mixture of forms and declensions which grammarians subdivide into (a) *abundantia*, viz. double forms for *nominative* and other cases, e.g. λεώς, λαός: (b) *heteroclita*, viz. a single nom. form with diverging forms in the oblique cases, e.g. ὁ and τὸ σκότος: (c) *metaplasta*, viz. formation of a new nom. out of the oblique cases, e.g. ἡ ᾠδίν. Mixture of this kind was common in the κοινή and has already been illustrated in the preceding sections: several of the instances which follow have classical precedent.

24. *Fluctuation between masculine and neuter in Decl. II.*

Τὸ ἀλάβαστρον (Theocr. N.T.) for class. ὁ ἀλάβαστος is read by A in 4 K. xxi. 13 (B ὁ ἀλάβαστρος).

The same MS has masc. ἄχυρος[3] (τὸν ἄχυρον) in 3 K. iv. 21: elsewhere in LXX τὸ ἄχυρον (class.).

Γαῖσος (ὁ) "javelin" (an imported word, said to be Iberian)

[1] Theodotion's spelling is supported by φρητός as from φρῆρ in a contemporary papyrus of ii/A.D.: Moulton *CR* xv. 435[a].

[2] Cf. Mayser 296 (τὸν συγγενέα ii/B.C.) and WH (ed. 2) App. 165: Dr Moulton calls my attention to συγγενέας in Dittenberger *Sylloge* 258. 20 (end of iii/B.C., Magnesia). The identity of forms in some of the cases of nouns in -ής and -εύς (e.g. acc. plur. in -εῖς) produced mixture throughout: cf. εὐθύς—εὐθής, § 12, 7.

[3] There is some doubtful authority for it in Comedy (see LS).

in Jos. viii. 18 BA has the support of Polybius (xviii. 18. 4, Teubner): F reads τὸ γαῖσον.

Δεσμός in Attic Greek has plural δεσμοί and δεσμά: the neuter,[1] in the κοινή has passed over to the literary forms, being restricted in LXX to 3 M. vi. 27, 4 M. xii. 3 (2 Es. vii. 26 A), in N.T. to Luke: commonly in LXX δεσμοί (even in the proverbial κύων ἐπὶ δεσμούς Prov. vii. 22, found elsewhere with δεσμά). (Δέσμη Ex. xii. 22 has a distinct meaning "bundle": a vulgar word found in Comedy and the papyri.)

Τὸ ζυγόν, apparently the older gender (Lat. *jugum*), is replaced almost everywhere in LXX (as in N.T. in the only determining passages) by ὁ ζυγός: with the meaning "balances" the neuter remains in L. xix. 36 ζυγὰ δίκαια, a passage which has influenced the text in Ez. xlv. 10 ζυγὸν δίκαιον AQ (ζυγὸς δίκαιος B: the other books use the masc. with this meaning also, Hos. xii. 7, Prov. xi. 1, xx. 17).

As regards θεμέλιος (sc. λίθος) and θεμέλιον we cannot speak with certainty as to the earlier usage. In the plural οἱ θεμέλιοι has good authority in Attic prose, while τὰ θεμέλια is poetical: on the other hand ὁ θεμέλιος appears to be vulgar and late: the dictum of Moeris that θεμέλιον and θεμέλια are the only true Attic forms is questionable[2]. In LXX τὰ θεμέλια is frequent (Dt. xxxii. 22, 2 K. xxii. 8, 16 [=Ψ xvii. 8, 16], Ψ lxxxi. 5, Prov. viii. 29, Sir. iii. 9 etc., Prophets *passim*). The masc. form is limited to the following: τὸν θεμέλιον 3 K. vi. 2 B (=v. 17 A), 4 K. xvi. 18: θεμέλιοι, θεμελίους, 2 Ch. xxxi. 7, 1 Es. vi. 19, 2 Es. iv. 12, v. 16, Job Θ xxii. 16: Ψ beside the neuter plurals locc. citt. has οἱ θεμέλιοι lxxxvi. 1, ὁ θεμέλιος cxxxvi. 7 (v.l. τῶν -ων). (In N.T. Lc. alone has τὰ -λια Acts xvi. 26: Paul, Hebrews and Apoc. have the masculine forms.)

[1] Absent from Ptolemaic papyri (Mayser 285). Dr Moulton reminds me of the original *collective* character of these old neuters: so *loca* of a region, *loci* of several isolated places.

[2] Kühner-Blass 1. i. 499, Mayser 289 (Ptolemaic papyri -ον -α).

It looks as if the earlier and later κοινή differed in their method of producing uniformity, the former using the neuter throughout, the latter the masc.

Τὸ κλοιόν is read by A in 3 K. xii. 4 (LS cite Byzantine grammarians for plur. κλοιά): elsewhere ὁ κλοιός (class.).

Ὁ λύχνος has plur. οἱ λύχνοι only (Att. also τὰ λύχνα).

Ὁ νῶτος, οἱ νῶτοι are the usual forms in LXX[1], the Attic neuter form being confined to Gen. ix. 23 (τὰ δύο νῶτα), Jer. ii. 27 (νῶτα).

Οἱ ὄνειροι W. xviii. 19 replaces Attic neuter plur. ὀνείρατα or ὄνειρα (Attic sing. ὁ ὄνειρος, τὸ ὄνειρον or τὸ ὄναρ). The word itself has joined the 'literary' vocabulary, ἐνύπνιον being used in the translations.

(Ὁ) σίελος (with Ionic ε) replaces Attic τὸ σίαλον in Is. xl. 15 (neut. σίελον A): the neuter plur. occurs in 1 K. xxi. 13 (τὰ σίελα).

Ὁ σῖτος, τὰ σῖτα of Attic Greek are retained, but the latter is restricted to two literary books (Job and Proverbs), the plur. in any form being absent elsewhere.

Τὸ στάδιον (Dan. O Sus. 37) has plur. σταδίους in the literary 2 M. (xi. 5 V, xii. 10 etc.) as in Attic Greek, which also uses στάδια. The latter appears to have been usual in the κοινή vernacular[2].

Ὁ σταθμός has plur. οἱ σταθμοί in all senses[3]. Attic wrote σταθμός "a halting-place," plur. σταθμοί and -μά, but σταθμόν -μά of "a weight[4]."

Τὸ χειμάρρουν 4 K. xxiii. 6 A is no doubt a slip for τῡ χ.

On the whole a tendency is traceable to replace all anomalous neuter plurals by masculine forms.

[1] 1 K. iv. 18, 3 K. vii. 19, 4 K. xvii. 14, 2 Es. xix. 29 (ἀπειθοῦντα), Ψ [lxv. 11 R$^{c.a}$], lxviii. 24, lxxx. 7 [cxxviii. 3 R], Zech. vii. 11, Is. l. 6, Ez. i. 18, x. 12. Elsewhere the gender is indeterminate.

[2] Mayser 289, Crönert 175.

[3] N. xxxiii. 1f., Prov. viii. 34, Is. xxviii. 17. So the papyri, Mayser 263.

[4] K.-Bl. I. i. 500. A has τὸ σταθμόν 4 K. xxi. 13 (B στάθμιον).

25. *Fluctuation between Declensions I. and II.* Nouns compounded from ἄρχω have their termination in -αρχος in Attic Greek: in the κοινή the form -άρχης (which originated in Ionic districts) is usual and gradually ousts the other form. The Attic termination maintains its hold longest in compounds of numerals and in old official titles: new compounds nearly all end in -άρχης[1]. The Attic forms retained in LXX are δεκάδαρχος, ἑκατόνταρχος[2], ἔπαρχος, μόναρχος, πεντηκόνταρχος, ὕπαρχος (1 Es. vi. 26 B), χιλίαρχος. On the other hand LXX writes the following more newly-coined words with -άρχης: γενεσιάρχης, ἐθνάρχης, ἐλεφαντάρχης, Κυπριάρχης (governor of Cyprus 2 M. xii. 2), κωμάρχης, μεριδάρχης, πατριάρχης[3], τοπάρχης. In the following old words both forms occur: ἱππάρχαι[4] 2 K. i. 6 B, ἵππαρχοι A: φύλαρχος Dt. xxxi. 28, 1 Es. viii. 58, 92, but φυλάρχης 2 M. viii. 32.

The N.T. shows an advance upon the LXX in one word: ἑκατόνταρχος of LXX appears in N.T. with few exceptions as ἑκατοντάρχης: χιλίαρχος is however still universal. Ἑκατοντάρχης is also the predominant form in Josephus and δεκαδάρχης is universal in his *Jewish War*: χιλίαρχος is still the usual form, but there is some slight MS evidence even for χιλίαρχης[5].

26. The following words show the converse change—transition from the first to the second declension. Ἀμφίταπος 2 K. xvii. 28, Prov. vii. 16 replaces ἀμφιτάπης (Comedians of iv/B.C. ap. LS). Ἔνεδρον has supplanted the classical ἐνέδρα, which occurs only in Jos. viii. 7, 9 (beside ἔνεδρον 6 times in the same chap.) and Ψ ix. 29, in all three passages with the meaning "place of ambush," whereas ἔνεδρον in Joshua (and

[1] Mayser 256 f., where the literature is quoted. Cf. Moulton *CR* xv. 34. 434, xviii. 108 for the post-Ptolemaic papyri. It is noticeable that all specially Egyptian titles end in -άρχης: Θηβάρχης, Λιβυάρχης, νομάρχης (so Hdt.).

[2] Excepting 4 K. xi. 10 B, 15 B -άρχαις (ib. 9 B[b] -άρχαι).

[3] Πατρίαρχον Is. xxxvii. 38 Q is an incorrect reading for the adj. πάτραρχον "ancestral" (sc. θεόν).

[4] So in the papyri from iii/B.C.: the B text is therefore right.

[5] W. Schmidt *De Jos. eloc.* 485 ff.

usually in LXX) means the ambuscading party. Ἦχος (ὁ or τὸ, 29 *inf.*) has entirely replaced Attic ἠχή.

Μανδράγορος[1] for μανδραγόρας has good authority in Gen. xxx. 15 (-όρους *AD* cursives: -όρας E): the older form is kept in Cant. vii. 13 -γόραι B𝔖 (for A see 27 below).

Ἕσπερος for ἑσπέρα, a v.l. of A in Jos. v. 10 ⟨ἀφ' ἑσπέρου: ἀπὸ [ἀφ'] ἑσπέρας BF), is poetical. Ἀμάξοις Is. xxv. 10 𝔖*vid and πύλοις 1 M. xiii. 33 V may be clerical errors (the latter receives doubtful support from Hom. *Il.* v. 397).

Τὸ βασίλειον in addition to its old meaning "palace" (Hdt.) takes on that of "crown" (2 K. i. 10, 2 Ch. xxiii. 11, W. v. 16) and "royal dominion" and so in some late portions of LXX becomes identical with ἡ βασιλεία "kingdom" (which is frequent elsewhere in LXX): Hexaplaric additions (from Aquila apparently) in 3 K. iv. 19 A, xiv. 8 A, 4 K. xv. 19 A: 1 Es. iv. 40, 43: Dan. Ο iv. 30 c etc. (in vii. 22=τὴν βασιλείαν Θ): 2 M. ii. 17 (and perhaps in W. i. 14 οὔτε ᾅδου βασ. ἐπὶ γῆς, R.V. "royal dominion," mg. "a royal house": in 1 Ch. xxviii. 4 γένος should be supplied).

Both forms πλευρά and πλευρόν are classical, and both are used in LXX, the former slightly more often than the latter: there is diversity of reading in 2 K. xiii. 34, πλευρᾶς B (-ρου A), Dan. Θ vii. 5 τρεῖς πλευραὶ B=τρία πλευρά A (Dan. Ο ib. πλευροῦ), 4 M. vi. 6 τὰ πλευρά A𝔖* ⟨τὰ πλευράς *sic* 𝔖c.a⟩: in Ez. xli. 5 f. the two forms are found in conjunction. There is also diversity of reading in 2 M. vii. 1 νευραῖς A (-ροις V) "cords": both forms are classical.

27. *Fluctuation between Declensions I and III.*

Τὸ νῖκος[2] supplants ἡ νίκη universally in the later versions (α′σ′θ′) and largely in the LXX: the latter is now restricted to 'literary' writings (1 Es., Prov., 1—4 M. with 1 Ch. xxix. 11), but νῖκος has even invaded books of that type (2 M. x. 38, 4 M. xvii. 12). Ἡ δίψα and τὸ δίψος (both classical) are used interchangeably even in the same context[3]. Βλάβη W. xi. 19 (βλάβος, also classical, is not found).

Ἀκάν (4 K. xiv. 9 τὸν ἄκανα B, τὴν ἄκανα[ν] A) supplants in

[1] So in Test. XII. Patr. Is. i. 3, ii. 2, 4.
[2] In a papyrus of 56 B.C.: νίκη in ii/ and i/B.C. (Mayser 93).
[3] W. xi. 4 δίψης, 8 δίψους: Am. viii. 11 δίψαν, 13 δίψει.

this LXX passage and elsewhere in α′σ′θ′ the classical ἡ ἄκανθα (still common in LXX)[1].

The following variants are of interest. Δόξεως Is. lxvi. 11 ℵ gen. as from δόξις (= δόξα) is attested elsewhere[2]. Μανδράγορες Cant. vii. 13 A (-αι cett.) and φιάλες ib. v. 13 A (-αι cett.) anticipate modern Greek, which uses these plurals in all words of the old 1st declension (καρδιές, θάλασσες etc.). The same MS has the datives πύλει, πύλεσιν in K. γδ (3 K. xxii. 10, 4 K. vii. 18), as if from a nom. τὸ πύλος (cf. πύλοις 26 *supra*).

28. *Fluctuation between Declensions II and III.* Interchange of nouns in -ος masc. (Decl. II) and in -ος neut. (Decl. III) began in classical times. The general tendency in κοινή Greek is in the direction of the neuter third declension forms, as will be seen from the following table:

Classical Greek.	LXX.		N.T.[3]
	masc.	neut.	
ὁ ἔλεος	ὁ ἔλ. sporadically (literary)[4]	τὸ ἔλεος usually	τὸ ἔλεος always
ὁ ζῆλος	ὁ ζῆλ. usually	τὸ ζῆλ. rarely[5]	τὸ and ὁ ζ.
ὁ and τὸ θάμβος	θάμβοι Eccl. xii. 5	gen. θάμβους Cant. iii. 8 (W. x. 19 ℵ)	τὸ θ. (Acts iii. 10 gen. -βους)

[1] Ὁ ἄκανος occurs in Theophrastus and Symmachus.

[2] LS cite "Democrit. ap. Sext. Emp." The form, we may conjecture, comes from the later writer.

[3] WH (ed. 2) App. 165.

[4] The literary translator of Prov. uses the masc. only (iii. 16ª, xiv. 22 *bis*), as does the writer of 4 M. in his single use of the word (ix. 4). The following sporadic exx. occur: Ψ v. 8 τοῦ ἐλέου σου BA, which might be a case of dropping one σ out of two (§ 9, 1), but it is noticeable that Ψ, which has upwards of 100 exx. of the neut., has only one other of the masc., viz. lxxxiii. 12 ἔλεον, i.e. the masc. is written *on the first appearance of the word in either part of the Greek book* (p. 68 f.): Job x. 12 A, Tob. viii. 17 ℵ (ib. ἔλεος neut.), W. vi. 6 A, Sir. li. 3 B*: Hos. xii. 6, Mic. vi. 8 B, vii. 20 B: Is. lx. 10 BℵQ, lxiii. 7 (ib. τὸ ἔλ.), lxiv. 4: Jer. xlv. 26 B ῥίπτειν τὸν ἔλ., a phrase imitated in Dan. Θ ix. 20, Bar. ii. 19, in which the noun = "a pitiful supplication": Dan. Θ i. 9, 1 M. iii. 44 A, 2 M. vi. 16, viii. 5, 3 M. iv. 4 τὸν κοινὸν ἔλ. "the general misery."

[5] Τὸ ζ. W. v. 17 ℵ: gen. ζήλους Zeph. i. 18 BℵA, iii. 8 B*Q, 1 M. ii. 58 ℵ, and in interpolations from Θ in Ez. viii. 3 Q, 5 A.

Classical Greek.	LXX. masc.	LXX. neut.	N.T.
ὁ (and τὸ: Aristotle πάγεσι) πάγος "frost"	πάγοι Dan. Ο iii. 69	τὸ π. Na. iii. 17 gen. πάγους BℵQ (-ου A): Job Θ xxxvii. 10 acc. πάγος	unused (τὸν Ἄρειον πάγον)
ὁ πλοῦτος	ὁ πλοῦτος usually	τὸ πλ. Is. xxix. 2 ℵAΓ (ὁ BQ)	ὁ and (8 times in Paul) τὸ πλ.
ὁ (and rarely τὸ) σκότος	—	τὸ σκότος always	τὸ σκ. always

The following isolated exx. occur.

Τὸ γνόφος gen. -ους Est. A 7 A (γνύφου Bℵ and masc. elsewhere in LXX as in N.T., Heb. xii. 18): ὁ δνόφος was the class. (poetical) form, ὁ γνόφος begins with Aristotle.

Τὸ ῥύπος Is. iv. 4 Γ (masc. in the other MSS and elsewhere in LXX and N.T.: the plur. ῥύπα is Homeric).

ΧΙΡΟΥϹ stands for χειρός in Jer. xli. 3 ℵ.

29. In the following a classical first declension word in -ή has passed over first to the second declension and then to the third:

Classical Greek.	LXX. M. and F.	LXX. N.	N.T.
ἡ ἠχή ὁ ἦχος (from Aristot.)	— ὁ ἦχ. usually	— τὸ ἦχ.[1] occasionally	— ὁ Heb. xii. 19 (ἤχῳ) τὸ Lc. xxi. 25 (ἤχους: WH ἠχοῦς)
ἡ ταραχή ὁ τάραχος (Xen.)	ἡ τ. frequent ὁ τ. Jd. xi. 35 B, 1 K. v. 9, Est. A 7	τὸ τ. Job Θ xxiv. 17 BℵC, Is. xxii. 5 ℵ (gen. -χους)	ἡ. τ. 'Jo.' v. 4 ὁ τ. twice (Acts)

30. Examples of the reverse change (gen. -ου for -ους) are confined to readings of single MSS: βάθου Sir. li. 5 B*, ἔθνου

[1] In Jer. xxviii. 16 ἦχος appears to be accusative. It is probable therefore that the gen. ηχους should be accented ἤχους, not as the classical ἠχοῦς from ἠχώ, in Ψ ix. 7, xli. 5 ART (ηχου Bℵ), lxxvi. 18, Sir. xlvii. 9.

Prov. xxviii. 15 A, *τεμένου* 2 M. i. 15 A (before initial *σ*), *ὕψου* Ψ ci. 20 ℵ: so *τῖχον* Jer. i. 18 A (as acc. of *τεῖχος*).

31. Transition from Declension II to Declension III in the *κοινή* occurs also in some contracted words in *-οῦς* which are now declined like *βοῦς*. So even in the Atticizing writer of 4 Macc. *νοῦς* has gen. *νοός*[1]. Χοῦς "earth" (probably originally second declension)[2] similarly has gen. *χοός* Eccl. iii. 20, dat. *χοί* 2 K. xvi. 13 B (χοει A) and is therefore indistinguishable from χοῦς (or *χοεύς*) the liquid measure (third declension in Attic).

An accus. *τὸν ἵκτερα* occurs in L. xxvi. 16 B (*ἵκτερον* AF: class. *ὁ ἵκτερος*). The dat. *δένδρ(ε)ι* Dt. xxii. 6 B*A has Attic authority (elsewhere in LXX *-ου -ῳ*).

Transition from Declension III to II in dat. plur. is illustrated by the variants *ἐλεφάντοις* 1 M. i. 17 V, *τεσσάροις* Ez. i. 10 A (but *τέσσαρσι* in same verse)[3].

§ 11. Proper Names.

1. In the translated books we find a medley of transliterated (indeclinable) *personal names* and names which are, partly at least, Hellenized and declined. The general distinction made is that names which in the Hebrew end in a consonant remain unaltered (Ἀδάμ, Ἀβραάμ, Δανείδ, Ἰσραήλ, Ἰωσήφ etc.), while those which end in a vowel, especially in ה֫, are in most cases declined like nouns of the first declension, the feminines requiring no addition in the nominative, the masculines taking on the termination *-ίας* and being declined like Νικίας. Names ending in other vowels are either Hellenized by the addition of ς and form a new class of first declension names in *-ᾶς*, *-ῆς*, *-οῦς* etc. (Ἰωνᾶς, Μωυσῆς, Ἰησοῦς etc.) or remain indeclinable (Ἠλειού).

[1] i. 35. So N.T. *νοός νοί*, *πλοός*. Elsewhere LXX has no exx. of gen. or dat. of *νοῦς* and there are none of *πλοῦς*: 3 M. iv. 10 has the Attic *κατάπλῳ*. [2] K.-Bl. I. i. 498.

[3] Ῥινόν Job xl. 20 C is not another form of *ῥῖνα* BℵA (from *ῥίς*) but a different word, "hide."

2. Names declined according to Declension II (in -ος)[1] or Declension III (-ης, -ους : -ών, -ῶνος etc.) are almost unrepresented in the translations. Literary writers like Josephus and the paraphrastic writer of 1 Esdras[2], on the other hand, employ these freely, carrying out the Hellenization in all cases (Ἄβραμος, Δαβίδης etc.). In N.T. times a few of these Hellenized forms have permeated into the popular language (Σολομών -μῶνος).

3. Feminines declined like Declension I are e.g. Ἄννα, Βάλλα[3], Γοθολία[4], Δείνα[5], Ἐλιβέμα (Ὀλ.)[6], Ζέλφα, Ζωσάρα or Σωσ. (Haman's wife Zeresh), Κασ(σ)ία Job xlii. 14, Λεία, Ὄλδα, Ὄολα (Ὄολλα), Ὀόλιβα (Ὄολ.), Ῥεβέκκα, Σαρου(ε)ία[7], Σάρ(ρ)α, Σουσάννα, Χεττούρα. The genitive and dative, wherever attested, are in -ας, -ᾳ, whether the α of the nom. be pure or impure, the only exception being Σουσάννης Dan. Θ Sus. 27 f. B (the other uncials -ας and so Dan. O Sus. 30 : cf. § 10, 4).

4. A large number of Hebrew masculine proper names end with the Divine name Yahweh in a more or less abbreviated form, usually יָהּ (also יָהוּ, יּ). These are in the majority of cases Hellenized by the adoption of the old termination -ίας (as in Νικίας), and forms in -(ε)ίας, -αίας declined according to the first declension abound. The genitive termination of these names is commonly -ου, as in Attic and in the Ptolemaic papyri[8],

[1] Ἀγγαῖος: Νεεμιος 2 Es. ii. 2 B seems to be a slip for -ίας.

[2] He shows much ingenuity in dealing with the long lists of names, which in the other version (2 Esdras) are baldly reproduced, and even some sense of humour, when he renders "Rehum the Chancellor" by Ῥάθυμος ὁ (γράφων) τὰ προσπίπτοντα (ii. 16, 21), "Slack the Secretary."

[3] 1 Ch. vii. 13 A (*vioì*) Βαλλα may be indecl. (Βαλλά) or gen. as from Βάλλας.

[4] But τὴν Γοθολιά 2 Ch. xxiii. 21 B (-αν A).

[5] Τὴν Δεινά Gen. xxxiv. 26 A (-αν D^{vid} E): ib. xxx. 21 read Δείνα not Δεινά (Swete), the nom. being usual after verbs of naming.

[6] Indecl. in Gen. xxxvi. 2 AD (-βαιμαν E with O.L.), 18 E. Ib. xxxvi. 41, 1 Ch. i. 52 Ἐλ(ε)ιβαμας may be nom. masc. (-ᾶς Swete) or gen. fem.

[7] In 1 K. xxvi. 6 B, 2—3 K. and 1 Ch. xviii. 12 BA. But indecl. Σαρουιά (=gen.) 1 K. xxvi. 6 A, 2 K. ii. 13 A, 18 B, and in 1 Ch. *passim* (B text).

[8] Mayser 250 f.

not the 'Doric' -α: so always (or with a rare v.l.) e.g. Ἀνανίου, Ἐζεκίου, Ζαχαρίου, Ἠσαίου, Ἰερεμίου, Ἰεχονίου, Μαασ(σ)αίου, Σελεμίου, Σοφονίου, Χελκίου. The use of the gen. in -α appears to be vulgar and late. The following examples are certain: Μειχαίας gen. -α Jd. B text (xvii. 8 ff.), 2 Ch. xxxiv. 20 (-ου 4 K. xxii. 12), Νεεμίας -α 2 Es. (but -ου in 1 Es. Sir. 2 M.), Τωβ(ε)ίας -α Tob. i. 20 ℵ, vii. 7 ℵ, xi. 17 ℵ, 19 BA (-ου i. 20 A, ix. 5 ℵ). There is also strong attestation for the gen. Ἰωσεία (throughout Jeremiah, i. 2 etc., 4 K. xxiii. 23 B, 2 Ch. xxxv. 16, 19, 26). Jeremiah also occasionally has Σεδεκία (i. 3 BℵA, xlvi. 1 B, 2 Bℵ, lii. 11 ℵ) in place of the usual -κίου: add further Jdth xiv. 6 Ὀζεία BA.

5. Much difficulty, however, presents itself, especially in the long lists and genealogies in Chron. and 2 Es., in determining whether a form in -ια represents a Doric gen. (therefore -ία) or a mere transliteration (therefore -ιά). These lists exhibit a strange mixture of declined names in -ίας and indeclinables, nom. -ιά. The practice of the books with regard to nom. and acc. (e.g. Νεεμίας -αν) can alone determine the accent in the case of the gen. (Νεεμία). Possibly the lists in the original version were omitted or were much shorter, and they have subsequently been supplemented from another source in which the names were undeclined: we often find two or three declined names at the beginning followed by a string of indeclinables. Take for instance 2 Es. xviii. 4 (the brackets indicate the possibly later additions): καὶ ἔστη Ἔσρας...καὶ ἔστησεν ἐχόμενα αὐτοῦ Ματταθίας καὶ Σαμαίας [καὶ Ἀνανιὰ καὶ Οὐριὰ καὶ Ἑλκειὰ καὶ Μαασσαιὰ] ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐξ ἀριστερῶν Φαδαίας καὶ Μεισαὴλ καὶ Μελχείας καὶ Ζαχαρίας or vii. 1 Ἔσρας υἱὸς Σαραίου υἱοῦ Ζαρείου [υἱοῦ Ἑλκειὰ κ.τ.λ.].

The longer Heb. forms in יָהוּ are in some names kept in the Greek as indeclinables in -(ε)ιού. Elijah in the historical books is Ἠλ(ε)ιού: the N.T. form Ἠλ(ε)ίας only in Mal. iv. 4 and in apocryphal books (Sir., 1 M.). Obadiah appears as Ἀβδειού or Ὀβδειού.

6. The declension of Hebrew masc. proper names ending in a vowel sound other than יָהּ follows what Blass (N.T. § 10, 3) calls the '*mixed declension*.' In this the pure stem stands unaltered in three cases (G. D. V.), while in the nom. it has ς

appended to it, in the acc. *ν*. The nominatives end in *-ας* (*-ᾶς*), *-ῆς*, *-(ε)ίς*, *-οῦς*.

This declension has nothing exactly answering to it in the papyri, where the proper names are usually of the third declension (*-ᾶς -ᾶτος*: *-ῆς -ῆτος*: *-οῦς -οῦτος* etc.: Mayser 273 ff.). A desire to adhere as closely as possible to the Hebrew names and also perhaps to avoid the familiar forms of common life in rendering Scripture may account for this new departure.

(1) In *-ας* (*ᾶς*). Ἰούδας *-δαν -δα -δᾳ* is the constant declension for patriarch, tribe and country. Occasionally the name remains indeclinable, Ἰουδά being used for nom. and acc.[1] The gen. Ἰούδου is confined to 1 and 2 Maccabees, and there to Judas Maccabaeus[2], while Ἰούδα is used of the tribe and country (*ἄρχοντες, γῆ* Ἰούδα etc.). Ἔσδρας and Ἰωνᾶς similarly have acc. *-αν* (*-ᾶν*), other cases *-α*. Σατανᾶς (שָׂטָן) is found in the acc. Σατανᾶν Job ii. 3 A, Sir. xxi. 27 (elsewhere Σατάν or *διάβολος*). Other words are found only in the nom., e.g. Εἰρᾶς (Εἴρας), Ἐλιωνᾶς, Ὠνᾶς.

(2) In *-ῆς*. Μωυσῆς[3] in LXX is with few exceptions declined according to the 'mixed' declension: *-ῆν*, *-ῆ*, *-ῆ*, voc. *ῆ*. In the first century A.D., on the other hand, both literary writers

[1] So in its first appearance, where the original Hebrew form seemed more appropriate: Gen. xxix. 35 *ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ* Ἰουδά (=nom., cf. iii. 20 *ἐκάλεσεν...τὸ ὄν....Ζωή*). Otherwise rare, except in 2 Ch., 2 Es., Jer. (mainly *β*), which have *πᾶς* Ἰουδά, *πάντα τὸν* Ἰουδά etc. fairly frequently of the tribe. Once only in a 'Greek' book does Ἰουδά (? Ἰούδα) stand for acc., 2 M. xiv. 13 (N. and A. *-ας -αν* in the same chapter).

[2] 1 M. iv. 13 (ιογλογ A), 19 (do.), v. 61 A, ix. 12 A, 22 AV etc., 2 M. xii. 21 AV etc. The unusual gen. naturally puzzled the scribes and *-δα* is a constant variant.

[3] This is clearly the older orthography: Μωσῆς, which is nearer to the Heb. מֹשֶׁה, has quite inferior support. Though the Egyptian etymology given by Philo (*Vit. Mos.* I. 4) and Josephus (*Ant.* II. 9, 6, *c. Ap.* I. 31), viz. *μῶυ*=*ὕδωρ*, *ἐσῆς*=*σωθείς*, is now abandoned by Coptic scholars, at least it attests the antiquity of the form with *υ*. Whatever the origin of the name, there can be little doubt that the diphthong *ωυ* is an attempt to reproduce the Egyptian pronunciation, being found in the Greek rendering of Egyptian proper names and months such as Θῶυθ, Σαμῶυς (Mayser 138). The *υ* disappeared later: Θῶυθ (Θῶυτ) was written in the earlier Ptolemaic age, Θώθ (Θώτ) under the Roman Empire (ib. 185).

(Philo and Josephus) and the vernacular writers of the N.T. used the third declension forms for gen. and dat., Μωυσέως, Μωυσεῖ, keeping -ῆν in the acc.[1] In LXX the gen. Μω(υ)σέως is confined to a few passages, several occurring in a group of books which we have reason to believe are of late date[2]. The dat. Μωυσεῖ is more frequent, but this is really a mere matter of orthography: the gen. Μωυσέως appears to have grown (on the analogy of βασιλέως -λεῖ) out of Μωυσεῖ, which originally was only another way of spelling Μωυσῆ (§ 6, 21).

Like Μωυσῆς are declined Πετρεφῆς (Πετεφρῆς), Potiphar, gen. -ῆ, dat. -ῇ, and Μανασσῆς gen. -ῆ when used of King Manasseh, Judith's husband and other individuals (Tob. xiv. 10, 1 Es. ix. 33 A): on the other hand Μανασσή indecl. is used of the tribe[3] and its progenitor.

(3) In -(ε)ις. Λεύ(ε)ις = לוי Gen. xxxiv. 25 E, xxxv. 23 AE, 1 Es. ix. 14, acc. -ειν 4 M. ii. 19 AᵃV: elsewhere indecl. Λευ(ε)ί. Τώβεις -ειν in Cod. ℵ, 2 Es. xiv. 3 (-Τωβίας cett.) and in Tob. x. 8, xi. 10 (--βείτ BA), 18, xii. 4: once in B as an indeclinable[4], 1 Es. v. 28. Χάβρεις -ειν and Χάρμεις[5] -ειν Jdth vi. 15, viii. 10, x. 6. Χανάν(ε)ις -ειν N. xxi. 1 BF, 3 BF, xxxiii. 40 BAF = כנעני an inhabitant of Canaan (usually Χαναναῖος, also Χανανείτης 3 K. iv. 32 B and Χαναν(ε)ί N. xxi. 3 A, 2 Es. ix. 1)[6].

(4) In -οῦς. Ἰησοῦς (Joshua) has, like Ἰησοῦς (Χριστός)

[1] Lc. once even has acc. Μωυσέα (xvi. 29): elsewhere in N.T. always Μωυσῆν -έως -εῖ (-ῇ Acts vii. 44).

[2] In Pent. only Ex. iv. 6 A (BF αὐτοῦ with Heb.): Jd. i. 16 B (but -σῇ iii. 4 BA, iv. 11 BA), 3 K. ii. 3 BA, 4 K. xxiii. 25 A, 2 Es. iii. 2 A, Dan. Θ ix. 11 B (but -σῇ 13): in the literary 1 Esdras v. 48 BA, vii. 6 BA, 9 BA, viii. 3 BA, ix. 39 B: in other apocryphal books Sir. xlvi. 7 BℵAC (but -σῇ 1), Tob. vi. 13 ℵ, vii. 11 ℵ, 12 BAℵ, 13 ℵ: and two or three times as a v.l. in late MSS (T, V, Γ).

[3] Μανασσῆς Jd. i. 27 A, Ψ cvii. 9 ART.

[4] The same section of 1 Es. has indecl. Ἀννείς, v. 16 B.

[5] Also indecl. Jer. xxvi. 2 ἐν Χαρμείς (=Carchemish). In Hexateuch and 1 Chr. indecl. Χαρμεί.

[6] In τὸν Ῥαβσαρείς 4 K. xviii. 17 A, Ναβουσαρείς Jer. xlvi. 3 the final s comes from the Heb. and the words are indeclinable.

in N.T., acc. *-οῦν* gen. *-οῦ*, but differs from the N.T. name in the dative, which throughout Dt. and Jos. is consistently written Ἰησοῖ[1], the N.T. form Ἰησοῦ appearing as an occasional variant. In the other books the dat. only occurs in three passages and there in the N.T. form Ἰησοῦ: Ex. xvii. 9 B*AF (but B^{b} *-σοι*), 1 Ch. xxiv. 11 BA, 1 Es. v. 65 BA. Ἰησοῖ even stands in three passages for the genitive; Ex. xvii. 14 B, 2 Es. ii. 36 B, xxii. 7 BA.

In the papyri, on the other hand, as Dr Moulton informs me, we find a gen. *Ἰησοῦτος* BM iii. p. 25 (105 A.D.): cf. OP 816.

Ἐλιοῦς *-οῦν* in Job. Other names are only represented in the nom., e.g. Σαμμοῦς, Ἐλεισοῦς, Θεησοῦς, 2 K. v. 14 ff. Φαλλού N. xxvi. 5 AF (=dat.) 8 (=gen.) is probably correctly accented as an indeclinable: the nom. Φαλλοῦς, however, occurs elsewhere.

7. Names in *-ών*, the termination being taken over from the Hebrew[2], are as a rule indeclinable in LXX: Ἀαρών, Σαμψών etc.

To one of these—the name Solomon—a special interest attaches. The process of Hellenization gradually affected both the first two vowels and the declension. As in the case of Moses, the LXX and the N.T. represent earlier and later stages respectively. The steps in the evolution, speaking generally, appear to have been in the following chronological order: as regards orthography Σαλωμών—Σαλομών—Σολομών[3]:

[1] On the analogy of datives of feminine names in *-ώ*, which in the papyri were declined (e.g.) Δημώ *-οῦν -οῦς -οῖ* (Mayser 268). A more frequent type, applicable also to masculine names, was (e.g.) Πατοῦς *-οῦν -οῦτος -οῦτι* (ib. 274 f.). The acc. *-οῦν*, which is common to both types and to the Biblical name, facilitated mixture of types in the other cases. Ἰησοῦς (=gen.) 1 Es. v. 8 A (cf. 2 Ch. xxxi. 15 B) may be another instance of transition to the *-ώ* type.

[2] The *ν* is sometimes appended to a final *ο* in the Hebrew.

[3] Σαλωμών represents most nearly the Heb. שְׁלֹמֹה of the M.T., except for the final *ν*, which is the first step towards Hellenization. The long vowel in the middle unaccented syllable could not long maintain its place, hence the transitional form Σαλομών arose: lastly, the short vowels flanking the liquid were assimilated, as they often are in this position (or with intervening *μ*) where a long syllable follows: cf. *ἐξολοθρεύειν* (p. 88), Σομόηλος (=Σαμουήλ) Aristeas § 47.

as regards declension (1) indeclinable; (2) *-ῶντα, -ῶντος*; (3) *-ῶνα, -ῶνος*.

(1) Σαλωμών indeclinable is the normal form throughout the LXX (including the literary 1 Esdras)[1].

(2) Σαλωμῶν *-ῶντα -ῶντος* (like Ξενοφῶν and the Greek equivalents of Egyptian names in the papyri, e.g. Πετεχῶν)[2] appears in Proverbs (probably translated not earlier than i/B.C.)[3] i. 1 B𝔖, xxv. 1 B: also in 3 K. i. 10 A, 4 M. xviii. 16 𝔖.

The same form of declension with o in the second syllable is found in 𝔖 (Prov. xxv. 1 and subscription, Wis. title and subscr.) and in 4 M. loc. cit. A.

Σολομῶντος occurs in 2 K. viii. 7 BA (in what is clearly a Greek gloss: the passage is absent from the M.T.)[4] and as a v.l. of A (C) in the passages from Prov. and Wis. cited.

(3) The declension Σολομών *-ῶνα -ῶνος* is that found in N.T.[5], Josephus and later writers[6]. In LXX the nom. Σολομών is read by A in 3 K. ii. 12, 2 Ch. vii. 1, 5; by 𝔖 (A) in Sir. xlvii. 13, 23: the cases have even slenderer support, Wis^{subscr} A, 4 M. xviii. 16 V, with Σαλωμῶνος Wis^{subscr} B, Σαλομῶνα Ψ lxxi.^{tit} R.

8. Names of *places* and *peoples*, like those of individuals, appear either as indeclinable transliterations or as Hellenized and declinable. Here, however, the Hellenized forms largely predominate. The translators, for the most part, had a fair knowledge of the geography, not only of Egypt, but also of other countries, and adopted the current Hellenized forms[7].

[1] And so in the headings to each of the Psalms of Solomon (the Greek dates from the end of i/B.C.) Ψαλμὸς τῷ Σαλωμών (Σαλομών). The declined form Σολομῶντος (*-μῶνος*) appears in the inscription and subscription to the whole work.

[2] Mayser 275 f.

[3] See p. 61.

[4] The gloss comes from 2 Ch. xii. 9 (where the usual Σαλωμών is written). There are two similar glosses from 2 Ch. in the next verse in 2 K. LXX.

[5] Always (WH) except Acts iii. 11, v. 12 Σολομῶντος.

[6] For Cyprian see C. H. Turner in *J. T. S.* ix. 86 f.

[7] E.g. Αἰθιοπία (Cush), Ἀντιλίβανος (Dt. i. 7, iii. 25, xi. 24, Jos. i. 4,

Sometimes we meet with a name in both forms, e.g. Ἐδώμ—Ἰδουμαία, Συχέμ—Σίκιμα: cf. Φυλιστιείμ—ἀλλόφυλοι (Φιλιστιαῖοι).

Rarely, apart from the later historical books, do we find places of importance like Damascus or Tyre transliterated. Τὴν Δαμάσεκ 3 K. xi. 14 B (passage not in M.T. or A). Σόρ (for Τύρος) in Jer. *a* (xxi. 13) and Ez. *a* (xxvi. 2 etc.): but Τύρος in Ez. *β* (xxviii. 2 etc.). Σηδαμείν, Σωρείν 2 Es. iii. 7 B: cf. ib. ix. 1 ὁ Μοσερεί = ὁ Αἰγύπτιος. Σομορών, Σεμερών etc. (for the more usual Σαμαρ(ε)ία) 3 K. xvi. 24, 2 Es. iv. 10, xiv. 2, Is. vii. 9 *bis*. Χερμέλ (τὸ and ὁ) Is. xxix. 17 *bis*, xxxii. 15 *bis*, xxxiii. 9 B (but Κάρμηλος ib. xxxii. 16, xxxiii. 9 ℵAQ, xxxv. 2 as elsewhere in LXX). Cf. τὸ Κεχάρ 2 K. xviii. 23 (=the Jordan valley, elsewhere ἡ περίχωρος τοῦ Ἰορδάνου as in N.T.).

9. Many place-names end in *-α* and are declined like *feminines* of Declension I: e.g. Γάζα *-αν*, *-ης*, *-ῃ*: Σαμαρεία *-αν*, *-ας*, *-ᾳ*: Παθούρης (Φαθωρῆς) gen., Παθ(ο)ύρῃ dat. (§ 10, 2) = Pathros or Upper Egypt (nom. wanting, but cf. Φαθούρα = Pethor, N. xxii. 5): Χαρρά = Haran Ez. xxvii. 23 BQ, Χαρρᾶς gen. Gen. xxix. 4 E (usually indecl. Χαρράν).

10. Names of *towns* as a rule end in *-α* and are declined like *neuters* of Declension II, with occasional transition (metaplasmus) to Declension I, especially where the nom. ends in *-(ρ)ρα*. The article stands in the fem. (sc. πόλις). Thus:

τὴν Ἄδιδα *-δοις*[1]	τὴν Βεθσοῦρα (or *-ούραν*), G. *-σούρων*[3], D. *-οις* (or *-ᾳ*)
(Ἄρβηλα) *-οις*[2]	
τὴν Βαίθαρρα N. xxxii. 36 A (*-ά(ρ)ραν* BF)	Βόσορρα[4], G. **-ας**

ix. 1: elsewhere Λίβανος), Ἰόππη, Καππαδοκία (Caphthor), Καρχηδών *-δόνιοι* (Χαρκ., = Tarshish Is. xxiii. 1 etc., Ez. xxvii. 12, xxxviii. 13: elsewhere Θαρσ(ε)ίς), Μεσοποταμία and Συρία (Aram etc.), Ῥόδιοι (Dodanim). The translators are of course thoroughly familiar with Egyptian geography. The identification of "the brook of Egypt" as Rhinocorura (Is. xxvii. 12) may be mentioned, and the introduction of tribes living by the Red Sea, Troglodytes and Minaeans, into Chronicles LXX, which, with other indications of Egyptian colouring, somewhat discredits the theory that the version of that book is the work of Theodotion.

[1] 1 M. xii. 38 (not Ἀδιδά, Swete), xiii. 13 (Ἀδείνοις ℵ, Ἀδίμοις V).

[2] 1 M. ix. 2.

[3] 2 M. xi. 5 συνεγγίσας Βεθσούρων (not *-ρών*, Swete): for the gen. after ἐγγίζειν cf. 1 M. xi. 4, xiii. 23 and for the form 1 M. vi. 49, xiv. 7.

[4] 1 M. v. 26 V (εἰς Βοσσορά Swete as indecl.). Probably it is neut. plur.

Γάζαρα Acc. *-αρα* (or *-άραν*) *-ων -οις*[1]
Γάλγαλα *-α -ων -οις*[2]
Γέραρα *-α -ων -οις*
Γόμορρα *-α -ας*[3]
Γόρτυνα Acc.[4]
Ἐκβάτανα *-α -ων -οις*
Ζόγορα (Zoar) Acc.[5]
Ἱεροσόλυμα *-α -ων -οις* (below)
Μέρρα[6] Acc. (or *-αν*), G. *-ας*
(Ῥάγα)[7] *-ων -οις*, also (as from Ῥάγη *-αι*) Acc. plur. *-ας* Tob. ix. 2 ℵ, 5 ℵ, Dat. *-ῃ* ib. vi. 10 BA
(Ῥινοκοροῦρα) *-ων* Is. xxvii. 12
Σάρεπτα *-ων* Ob. 20
Σίκιμα *-α -ων -οις*[8]
Σόδομα *-α -ων*[9] *-οις*
(Σοῦσα) *-οις* Est. i. 2 etc.: in the same book Acc. Σοῦσαν (which might also be indecl. as in 2 Es. xi. 1 ἐν Σουσάν)

11. The following names in *-α* are *indeclinable*: Βαιτ(ο)υλουά (Jdth: Βαιτούλια ℵ ii. 21, iv. 6), Λουζά (Swete Λοῦζα), Λομνά Λοβνά Λοβενά etc. = Libnah (but Λόβναν, Λόμναν Is. xxxvii. 8 Bℵ), Ῥαμά (another transliteration Ἀρμαθάιμ in 1 K.), Σαβά (βασίλισσα Σ. etc.)[10], and the mountains Σ(ε)ινά, Φασγά.

Names in *-ή* are usually indeclinable, the termination of acc. or gen. being sometimes appended: Μαμβρή (but G. xiii. 18 τὴν δρῦν τὴν Μαμβρήν AE), Νινευή (but acc. *-ήν* Jon. iii. 2 ℵ, Zeph. ii. 13 ℵ, gen. *-ῆς* Jon. iii. 6 ℵ), Ῥαμεσσή (but gen. *-σῶν* N. xxxiii. 3 AB^{a}, *-σῆς* 5 B^{ab}).

Ἱερουσαλήμ is consistently written in the translations and in several of the apocryphal books (1 Esdras, Sirach, Esther, Judith, Baruch, and as a rule 1 Macc.). The Hellenized form Ἱεροσόλυμα (as from ἱερός, Σόλυμοι) is limited to 2—4 Macc. and (beside Ἱερ.) Tobit and 1 Macc.

like Γόμορρα. The gen. in Gen. xxxvi. 33, 1 Ch. i. 44. The indeclinable form used elsewhere is Βοσόρ.

[1] Also indecl. Γαζηρά 2 K. v. 25 or Γάζερ.

[2] Also indecl. τῆς Γαλγαλά 1 K. x. 8 A or Γαλγάλ.

[3] So always in conjunction with Σοδόμων: Γομόρρων only Gen. xviii. 20 *D*, λαὸς Γομόρα (*-ρά*) Jer. xxiii. 14 ℵ.

[4] 1 M. xv. 23 ℵV (Γόρτυναν A).

[5] Probably neut. plur.: also indecl. Ζόγορ and Σήγωρ.

[6] Probably neut. plur. (not Μερρά, Swete): Ex. xv. 23 εἰς Μέρρα B (εἰς Μέρραν AF). Indecl. τῆς Μερράν Bar. iii. 23.

[7] Nom. not found: this is more probable than Ῥάγοι (Redpath).

[8] Also indecl. Συχέμ, frequent in Jd. (B text).

[9] I find no instance of gen. Σοδόμης cited by Redpath.

[10] But acc. τὸν Σάβαν Gen. xxv. 3 AD (personal name).

12. Place-names in *-ων* are declined or indeclinable mainly according to their rank and situation on or away from the main routes. This accounts for the declension of Ἀσκάλων *-ωνα* etc. (on the coast and on or close to a main trade-route), while Ekron which lay off the route appears as indeclinable Ἀκκαρών[1]. Two other names are declined: ἡ Βαβυλών *-ῶνα -ῶνος -ῶνι*[2] and similarly Σ(ϵ)ιδών (voc. *-ών* Is. xxiii. 4, Ez. xxviii. 22)[3]. The gentilic Μακεδών is regularly declined *-όνα* etc.: Μακεδών Μαγεδαών etc. (elsewhere Μαγεδ(δ)ώ) representing Megiddo are indeclinable. To the indeclinables belong further Ἀερμών (Ἑρμών: Mount H.), Ἀμμών, Ἀρνών, Γαβαών (Gibeon)[4], Κεδρών[5] (the brook Kidron), Κ(ϵ)ισών (ὁ of the brook, ἡ of the city), ὁ Σαρών, Σ(ϵ)ιών, Χεβρών.

13. The following towns end in *-ίς* (*-ίδα -ίδος*): Πτολεμαίς (1—3 M.: acc. *-αίδαν* 1 M. x. 1 A, § 10, 12), Φασηλίς *-ίδα* 1 M. xv. 23 ℵV (Βασιλείδαν A). The river Τίγρις (Τίγρης Dan. O x. 4) has acc. Τίγριν, gen. Τιγρίδος (Tob. vi. 2 ℵ).

Compounds of πόλις are declined like the noun: Διοσπόλει (Ez. β), Πενταπόλεως (W. x. 6), Περσέπολ(ϵ)ιν (2 M. ix. 2 A: Περσιπ. V), Τρίπολιν (2 M. xiv. 1). Similarly Egyptian place-names in *-ις*: Μέμφις *-ιν -εως -(ϵ)ι*, Σάις *-ιν* (Ez. β), Τάνις *-ιν -εως -(ϵ)ι*.

14. Names of *countries* or *districts*, when not simply transliterated, are expressed by *adjectival forms* (sc. χώρα). These in the case of countries outside Palestine end in (1) *-ίς -ίδος*:— ἡ Ἐλυμαίς, Dan. O viii. 2, Tob. ii. 10 (Ἑλλ. B), 1 M. vi. 1[6]: ἡ

[1] In Jos. xv. 11 A *εἰς Ἀκκαρωνά* the final vowel represents the Heb. ־ָה of direction: the name is indeclinable in the same verse (B and A texts).

[2] Βαβυλόνα *-όνος* Jer. xlvii. 7 ℵ, [lii. 12 ℵ^{a}], Ez. xxiii. 17 B. Acc. Βαβυλῶναν Jer. xxviii. 9 ℵ (§ 10, 12). Gen. Βαβυλως (corruption of *-ῶνος*) 2 Es. v. 17 B*.

[3] Σ(ϵ)ιδόνα Jer. xxix. 4 B, Ez. xxvii. 8 A.

[4] 1 Ch. xxi. 29 *ἐν* Γαβαῶνι A.

[5] It was natural that it should come to be regarded as gen. plur. of *κέδρος*, hence *ἐν τῷ χειμάρρῳ τῶν κέδρων*, 2 K. xv. 23 BA (the words are absent from M.T. and are doubtless a gloss): ib. *τὸν χειμάρρουν* Κεδρών B (A again writes *τῶν κ.*). The same Hellenization appears in N.T., John xviii. 1 (see Lightfoot *Biblical Essays* 173 f.).

[6] Read (cf. Josephus *A. J.* XII. 9. 1) *ἤκουσεν ὅτι ἐστὶν Ἐλυμαὶς ἐν τῇ*

Καρίς -ίδα, 1 M. xv. 23 A (τὴν Καρίαν ℵV): ἡ Περσίς (so already in Hdt.); (2) -(ε)ία:—(ἡ) Βαβυλωνία (1 Es. and Dan. Θ, Is. xi. 11, xiv. 23, xxxix. 1, Jer. xxviii. 24 A, 2 M. viii. 20, 3 M. vi. 6 A), Μηδ(ε)ία (apocr. books), Σειδωνία 3 K. xvii. 8; (3) -ικη:—ἡ Ἰνδική. The transliterated names of the districts of or on the borders of Palestine (Ἐδώμ, Μωάβ etc.) begin to be replaced by adjectives either in (4) -αία or (5) -(ε)ῖτις, forms which appear to have come into use c. 200 B.C.[1]; (4) Ἡ Γαλ(ε)ιλαία, Ἰδουμαία (beside Ἐδώμ), Ἰουδαία (beside γῆ Ἰούδα); (5) (beside Ἀμμών, Γαλαάδ etc.) ἡ Ἀμμανῖτις (2 M. iv. 26, v. 7), Αὐραν(ε)ῖτις (Ez. α: with v.ll. Ὡραν. Λωραν.), Αὐσ(ε)ῖτις (= Uz, Job), Βασαν(ε)ῖτις (Jos., Ez. α and Minor Proph.), Γαλααδ(ε)ῖτις (in the same group: also Jd. x. 8 A, 1 K. xxxi. 11, 2 K. ii. 4, 5, 9, 1 Ch. xxvi. 31, 2 Ch. xviii. 2 f, 1 M.), Θαιμαν(ε)ῖτις (= Teman: Job), Μωαβ(ε)ῖτις (Is., Jer. xxxi. 33, xxxii. 7), Σαμαρ(ε)ῖτις (1 M.)[2], Χανα(α)ν(ε)ῖτις (Zech. xi. 7), to which must be added the curious Μαβδαρ(ε)ῖτις (Μαδβ.) = מדבר "the desert" (Jos. v. 5, xviii. 12)[3]. The cases are -ίτιδος -ίτιδι -ῖτιν (only once acc. -ίτιδα, Jos. xiii. 11 B Γαλααδείτιδα).

15. *Mountains* also are expressed adjectively in two cases: τὸ Ἰταβύριον[4] (= Tabor) Hos. v. 1, Jer. xxvi. 18 (elsewhere

Πέρσιδι πόλις (A ἐν Ἐλύμαις, ℵV ἐν Λύμαις): the description of Elymais as a city is of course incorrect and accounts for the reading of A. Elsewhere in LXX Αἰλάμ (Ἐλάμ) or (in 2 Es. and 1 Es. v. 12 A) Ἠλάμ.

[1] They are absent from the Pentateuch, but perhaps from a feeling of the anachronism of using them of the patriarchal age. Isaiah has Ἰουδαία, Ἰδουμαία. The translators of Joshua, Ez. α and Minor Prophets are partial to them. The literal School (Jd, K. βδ) avoids them.

[2] Elsewhere Σαμαρ(ε)ία as in N.T. of district as well as city.

[3] ΒΑΔΔΑΡΓΕΙC Jos. xv. 60 is also probably a corruption of ΜΑΔΒΑΡΕΙΤΙC. The historian Eupolemus (c. 150 B.C.) ap. Eus. *P. E.* IX. 449 is an early extra-Biblical authority for these forms in -ῖτις: the extent of Solomon's kingdom is described in a letter of the monarch as τὴν Γαλιλαίαν καὶ Σαμαρεῖτιν καὶ Μωαβῖτιν καὶ Ἀμμανῖτιν καὶ Γαλαδῖτιν. Aristeas § 107 refers to τὴν Σαμαρεῖτιν λεγομένην. In Polyb. v. 71 τὴν Γαλᾶτιν appears from the context to stand for τὴν Γαλααδῖτιν. Josephus supplies us further with Γαυλανῖτις (or Γαυλων.: Golan), Ἐσεβωνῖτις (Σεβ., Heshbon), Τραχωνῖτις (also in N.T.).

[4] So in Josephus τὸ Ἰταβύριον ὄρος: Ἀταβύριον in Polyb. v. 70. 6. The

Θαβώρ): (τὸ) ὄρος τὸ Καρμήλιον, 3 K. xviii. 19 f. (contrast 42 τὸν Κάρμηλον as elsewhere in LXX), 4 K. ii. 25, iv. 25.

16. *Gentilic names*—of tribes and inhabitants of towns or districts—in Hebrew end in *-ī* and in LXX are either transliterated (rarely and mainly in the later historical books)[1] or (more often) Hellenized, usually with the termination *-αῖος* or *-(ε)ίτης*. Thus a Canaanite appears as (1) Χαναν(ε)ί 2 Es. ix. 1, N. xxi. 3 A; (2) Χανανεί̈ς[2] N. xxi. 1, 3, xxxiii. 40; (3) Χανανείτης 3 K. iv. 32 B; (4) elsewhere always Χαναναῖος.

It is difficult to determine what principle governed the choice of *-αῖος* or *-ίτης*. Generally speaking, the former denotes a member of a tribe or clan (Ἑβραῖος, Ἀμορραῖος etc.), the latter the inhabitant of a town (Βηθλεεμίτης etc.). But the distinction is by no means universal. Γαζαῖος and Γεθθαῖος denote inhabitants of cities (like Ἀθηναῖος, Θηβαῖος): Ἀμμανίτης, Γαλααδίτης, Ἰσμαηλίτης, Ἰσραηλίτης, Μωαβίτης are tribal names. The tendency in the later books seems to be to form all new gentilic names in *-ίτης*, fem. *-ῖτις* (*-ιν -ιδος -ιδι*), because these terminations corresponded most nearly to those of the Hebrew (-ī -īth). In English this termination has been given a still wider range: it is not from the LXX that we get e.g. the names Hittite (Χετταῖος) and Amorite. Sometimes we find alternative forms in *-αῖος* and *-(ε)ίτης* such as Μαδιηναῖος, Μαδιαν(ε)ίτης: one of Job's comforters is called Βάλδαδ ὁ Σαυχίτης in the body of the work (viii. 1 etc.) but B. ὁ Σαυχαίων τύραννος in the proem and conclusion (ii. 11, xlii. 17 e). In 2 K. xxiii. 25 ff. the interposition of a series of names in *-(ε)ίτης* between others in *-αῖος* (contrast 25 Ἀρωδαῖος A with 33 Ἀρωδείτης) points to an interpolated text.

Other terminations are (1) *-ιος*: Ἀζώτιος, Ἀράδιος, Ἀσσύριος, Σύριος, Σιδώνιος; (2) *-ηνός*: Γαζαρηνός 1 M. xv. 28 A, 35 A (cf. Τασβαρηνός 2 Es. i. 8 B); (3) *-εῦς* plur. *-εῖς*, in the Greek books Ἀλεξανδρεύς and Ταρσεῖς, in the translations Κιτιεῖς (Is. xxiii. 12, 1 M. viii. 5: elsewhere Κίτιοι Κιτιαῖοι or transliterated) and Ἀμαζονεῖς, Ἀλειμαζονεῖς, 2 Ch. xiv. 15, xxii. 1.

latter was also the name of heights in Rhodes and at Agrigentum, where there were temples to Ζεὺς Ἀταβύριος (art. Tabor, *Enc. Bibl.*), the name having been carried westward by Semitic colonists. The origin of the Hebrew name and of the prothetic vowel in its Greek dress is uncertain: we may perhaps compare Τουραίων B Ἰτουραίων A 1 Ch. v. 19.

[1] Contrast the names of the aboriginal inhabitants of Palestine in 2 Es. ix. 1 (τῷ Χανανεί, ὁ Ἐθεί, ὁ Φερεσθεί κ.τ.λ.) with the forms in *-αῖος* used elsewhere.

[2] Cf. ὁ Ἀμορις Gen. xiv. 13.

§ 12. ADJECTIVES.

1. **Declension.** *Adjectives in* -ος, -η (-α), -ον *and* -ος, -ον. On the whole the LXX follows classical precedent in the use of two or three terminations for adjectives in -ος. The movement towards the uniformity of modern Greek, in which every adjective has a special feminine form (*ἄδικη*, *ἥσυχη* etc.), has hardly begun.

Two exx. of compound words with fem. termination occur in Numbers: *ἀθῴα* N. v. 19 BAF, 28 BAF (*-ῷος* ℵ*): *ἀτειχίσταις* xiii. 20 B* (*-οις* B^{ab}AF, so Prov. xxv. 28).

The direction in which the language is moving may be indicated by the fact that several adjectives which in Attic fluctuate between 2 and 3 terminations in LXX are only found with 3: such are e.g. *ἄγριος*, *βέβαιος*, *δίκαιος*, *ἐλεύθερος*, *ἐνιαύσιος* (except N. vii. 88 F *ἀμνάδες ἐνιαύσιοι*), *μάταιος*, *ὅμοιος* (except Ez. xxxi. 8 A *semel ἐλάται ὅμοιοι*), *ὅσιος*. Similarly *ἕτοιμος* always has fem. *ἑτοίμη* except in Jdth ix. 6 BℵA.

Other words in *-ιος* fluctuate as in Attic. Such are *αἰώνιος*[1], *ἀνόσιος* (*-α* 3 M. v. 8, but *-ος* W. xii. 4), *παραθαλάσσιος*, *παράλιος*, *ὑποχείριος* (*-ίαν* Jos. vi. 2 B: else fem. *-ος*, as usually in Attic).

Attic fluctuates also in the declension of words in *-λος -μος -ρος*. Under this head we may note the following (the only passages in which the fem. is used): *θυγατέρα λοιμήν*, 1 K. i. 16 (the adjectival use "pestilent" is new), *φρονίμη* Sir. xxii. 4, *χρησίμης* Tob. iv. 18.

On the other hand *ἡ ἔρημος* is used to the exclusion of *ἡ ἐρήμη*: similarly *οὐράνιος -ος*. Noticeable also is 4 K. iii. 18 B *κοῦφος καὶ αὕτη* (*κούφη* A) and *σῷοι* (with *σφραγίδες*) Bel Θ 17 *bis* (A once corrects to Attic *σῶαι*).

2. The *contracted* adjectives in *-οῦς* are usual in LXX as in Attic: *ἀργυροῦς*, *χρυσοῦς*, *σιδηροῦς*, *χαλκοῦς*, *ἐρεᾶ* Ez. xliv. 17, *φοινικοῦν* Is. i. 18: *ἁπλοῦς*, *διπλοῦς* etc. The following *uncon-*

[1] Usually 2 term. as also in Attic and N.T.: fem. *-ια* L. xxv. 34, N. xxv. 13, Hb. iii. 6 BℵQ, Jer. xxxviii. 3 A, xxxix. 40 B, Ez. xxxv. 5 [9 B^a], xxxvii. 26 [contrast xvi. 60], 1 M. ii. 54 ℵV, 57 A.

tracted forms occur: in Sir. χρύσεος vi. 30 BℵAC, χρύσεοι xxvi. 18 Bℵ (ib. ἀργυρᾶς): so χρύσαιοι (=-εοι) 2 Es. viii. 27 A, and as a proper name Καταχρύσεα Dt. i. 1 (κατάχρυσος is the usual form of this late word): ℵ* has σιδηρέας 4 M. ix. 26, σιδηραίαις ib. 28.

Ἀθρόος (3 M. v. 14 -όους) is the usual Attic form.

The Epic form χάλκε(ι)ος occurs in Job (vi. 12 BℵC, xl. 13 BℵC, xli. 6 B, 19 Bℵ) and elsewhere: Jd. xvi. 21 B, 1 Es. i. 38 BA, Sir. xxviii. 20 B (χάλκεοι ℵA, χαλκοῖ C). Cf. σιδηρίῳ Job xix. 24 ℵ (=-είῳ).

Want of contraction in word-formation is seen in the poetical ἀεργός used in Prov. xiii. 4, xv. 19, xix. 12 (elsewhere Att. ἀργός).

3. The *Attic declension* in -ως is, as was stated (§ 10, 9), disappearing. Of the few adjectives of this class found in LXX two are on the way to becoming indeclinables. Ἵλεως alone is used with any frequency, and, except for one book, only in the nom., in the phrases ἵλεώς μοι "God forbid," ἵλεως γενέσθαι etc.: in 2 Macc. ἵλεως is used also for the acc.—vii. 37 A (ἵλεων V), x. 26 AV* (-ων Swete)—and for the gen., ii. 22 A ἵλεως γενομένου (ἵλεω V)[1]. Similarly ἐσχατογήρως stands for the gen. in Sir. xlii. 8 B ἐσχατογήρως κρινομένου (-γήρους ℵ, -γήρῳ -μένῳ AC), where the text of B is supported by a contemporary papyrus, ἐσχατογήρως ὄντος TP i. 7. 29 (117 B.C.)[2]: the dat., however, is regular, ἐσχατογήρῳ Sir. xli. 2. Ὑποχρέως appears in 1 K. xxii. 2 B (nom.) with dat. ὑπόχρεῳ Is. l. 1: the nom. of κατα-χρέῳ W. i. 4 is unattested.

Κάθιδρος is read by the uncials in Jer. viii. 6 (LS cite καθίδρως -ωτος from Basil).

4. **Πᾶς.** There are a number of instances in the LXX where πᾶν appears to be used for πάντα (acc. sing.). A solitary

[1] So ἀνίλεως=nom. plur. neut. in Test. XII. Patr. Gad v. 11 ἔκειτο τὰ ἥπατά μου ἀνίλεως κατὰ τοῦ Ἰωσήφ.

[2] Mayser 294. Perhaps influenced by γῆρας gen. γήρως.

example of this use of πᾶν in the papyri[1] rescues it from the suspicion of being a 'Biblical' usage. Assimilation of the masc. to the neuter form of the accusative is not surprising in the κοινή: the analogy of μέγαν and the preference for accusatives in ν (such as νύκταν, εὐγενῆν) might be responsible for the vulgarism.

On the other hand, the context of the first passage in the LXX and other considerations throw some doubt on the equation πᾶν = πάντα and suggest that in some of the passages at least we have to do with a *syntactical* colloquialism rather than a vulgarism of *accidence*.

The idiomatic use of the neuter of persons in the common LXX phrases πᾶν ἀρσενικόν, πᾶν πρωτότοκον etc. allows us, though with hesitation, to explain πᾶν as a true neuter in the following phrases containing an adjective or participle: ἐπάταξαν ...ὡσεὶ δέκα χιλιάδας ἀνδρῶν, πᾶν λιπαρὸν καὶ πάντα ἄνδρα δυνάμεως Jd. iii. 29 B: πᾶν δυνατὸν ἰσχύι 4 K. xv. 20 BA: πᾶν δυνατὸν καὶ πολεμιστήν κ.τ.λ., 2 Ch. xxxii. 21: perhaps also πᾶν προσπορευόμενον, τοῦτον...ἔνταξον 2 Es. vii. 17 BA: πᾶν ἔνδοξον Is. xxiii. 9 BℵAΓ (of persons): πᾶν περικειρόμενον τὰ κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ Jer. ix. 26 ℵAQ with πᾶν περικεκαρμένον κ.τ.λ. ib. xxxii. 9 BA.

It is less easy to explain on this principle πᾶν followed by the accusative of a masc. *substantive*. Yet, in the earliest occurrence of this, the participle and the relative clause following show that πᾶν is regarded as a true neuter: Ἰδοὺ δέδωκα ὑμῖν πᾶν χόρτον σπόριμον σπεῖρον σπέρμα ὅ ἐστιν ἐπάνω πάσης τῆς γῆς Gen. i. 29. (In the next verse the uncials have πάντα χόρτον: in ii. 5 E again has πᾶν χόρτον, perhaps influenced by πᾶν χλωρόν ib.)

[1] Πᾶν τὸν τόπον in a Paris papyrus of 163 B.C. (37. 11: Mayser 199) differs from the LXX exx. in the presence of the article. The Paris collection was edited half a century ago (1858) and one cannot be quite so sure of the accuracy of the editors as in more recent editions.

It seems possible therefore in the remaining passages to explain πᾶν as a neuter in apposition with the masc. substantive, a sort of extension of πᾶν ἀρσενικόν etc. (πᾶν οἰκέτην e.g. = πᾶν οἰκετικόν), though it is simpler on the whole to regard it in all these passages as = πάντα. It is to be observed that the article is never present and that the meaning is usually "every": the recurrence of certain phrases is also noticeable.

Πᾶν οἰκέτην, Ex. xii. 44 B*.

Πᾶν ὃν ἐὰν εἴπω...αὐτὸς οὐ πορεύσεται Jd. vii. 4 B.

Πᾶν λόγον R. iv. 7 B (τὸν λ. A): so 1 Ch. xxvii. 1 BA, 1 B, 2 Ch. xix. 11 *bis* BA.

Πᾶν ἄνδρα 1 K. xi. 8 B.

Πᾶν πόνον[1] 3 K. viii. 37 B, and so in the parallel 2 Ch. vi. 28 BA and Sir. xxxviii. 7 A(C)[2].

Πᾶν βουνόν 3 K. xv. 22 BA[3], Jer. ii. 20 BNQ, Ez.[4] xx. 28 B^{a}AQ, xxxiv. 6 BQ.

Πᾶν νίὸν δυνάμεως 3 K. xxi. 15 B.

Πᾶν τεκτόνα 4 K. xxiv. 14 BA.

Πᾶν οἶκον "every house," ib. xxv. 9 B. Πᾶν οἶκον Ἰσραήλ Ez. xxxvi. 10 BAQ, Jdth iv. 15 BA: πᾶν οἶκον Ἰούδα Jer. xiii. 11 BN.

Πᾶν δὲ ὑβριστήν Job xl. 6 BN.

"Ez. β" further supplies πᾶν λίθον xxviii. 13 BQ, πᾶν φόβον xxxviii. 21 BA.

Dan. Θ has πᾶν ὁρισμὸν καὶ στάσιν vi. 15 BA and πᾶν θεόν xi. 37 B (πάντα AQ and so BAQ in 36).

Cf. πᾶν ἄνδρα ὅσιον, πᾶν σοφὸν ἐν βουλῇ Ps. Sol. iii. 10 r, viii. 23 r.

The converse use of πάντα for πᾶν appears once in N, πάντα τεῖχος Is. ii. 15 (under the influence of the 2 exx. of πάντα preceding).

In Bel Θ 2 πας B* must be a mere slip for πάντας. For πάντες = πάντας see § 10. 15.

5. *Adjectives in* -ης *and* -υς. Examples of the *accusative in*

[1] Πᾶν συνάντημα, πᾶν πόνον, πᾶσαν προσευχήν shows the vernacular accusative πᾶν—πᾶσαν—πᾶν.

[2] Here τὸν πόνον BN appears from the Heb., which has no כל, to be right.

[3] But πάντα βουνόν ib. xiv. 23.

[4] This use of πᾶν appears clearly to go back to the translator or an early scribe of "Ezekiel β" (πάντα acc. sing. only in xxxvii. 21, xxxix. 20 in all uncials): Ez. α, on the other hand, writes πάντα ἄνεμον etc. v. 12, vi. 13, xiii. 18, xvi. 15, xvii. 21 and we should therefore read πάντα βουνόν in xx. 28 with B*.

-ῆν for -ῆ in adjectives in *-ής* are, like those of *νύκταν* etc. (§ 10, 12), with two exceptions, absent from the B text. We have *ὑγιῆν* Lev. xiii. 15 B*A^{a}: *ἀσεβῆν* Ψ ix. 23 A, x. 5 A, Prov. xxiv. 15 ℵ, Job xxxii. 3 A, Sir. xxi. 27 A, Is. v. 23 ℵ [xi. 4 ℵ$^{c.a}$]: *εὐσεβῆν* Sir. xiii. 17 Bℵ: *μονογενῆν* Ψ xxi. 21 AR, xxxiv. 17 ℵ$^{c.a}$ AR, Bar. iv. 16 A: *πολυτελῆν* Prov. i. 13 ℵ: *ἐπιφανῆν* Jl. ii. 31 ℵ: *ψυδῆν* Zech. viii. 17 ℵ [*ἀναιδῆν* Jer. viii. 5 ℵ$^{c.b}$].

The acc. of *ὑγιής* is *ὑγιῆ(ν)* L. xiii. 15, Tob. xii. 3, not the Attic *ὑγιᾶ*.

6. **Πλήρης**. A mass of evidence has recently been collected demonstrating beyond a doubt that this adjective was at one time treated as an indeclinable[1]. The LXX contributes its share, but the evidence is not as a rule so strong as to warrant our attributing the form to the autographs: in most cases it is certainly due to later scribes. Indeclinable *πλήρης* is common in the papyri from i/A.D. onwards, but only one instance B.C. has yet been found[2].

We have seen in the case of the Attic declension in *-ως* (3 *supra*) that forms on the way to extinction become indeclinable before finally disappearing. The old adjectives in *-ής* have disappeared from the modern language[3], and this might account for *all* adjectives in *-ης* becoming indeclinable, but such is not the case. Why is this adjective alone affected?

Nestle has quoted an apt parallel in the indeclinable use of German *voller* in the phrase "eine Arbeit voller Fehler": but it is precarious to explain the Greek use by an idiom, however similar, in a modern language. The explanation is perhaps partly to be found in the tendency to assimilate the vowels flanking *ρ* or the nasals. At a time when *η*, *ει* and *ε* had come to be pronounced alike, there would be a tendency

[1] C. H. Turner in *J. T. S.* i. 120 ff., 561 f.: Blass N.T. 81: Moulton *CR* xv. 35, 435, xviii. 109: Crönert 179: Reinhold 53.

[2] *Μαρσείπειον πλήρης* (=*πλῆρες*) Leiden Pap. C. p. 118 col. 2, 14 (160 B.C.).

[3] Thumb *Handbuch* 49.

to write πλήρης for πλῆρες and for πλήρεις as well as for the nominative. Subsequently this form would also replace πλήρη and πλήρους.

The LXX instances (only once without v.ll.) are as follows.

Πλήρης=(a) acc. sing. (πλήρη): L. ii. 2 B, N. vii. 20 B**א***, 62 BA, xxiv. 13 A.

(b) nom. and acc. neut. sing. (πλῆρες): Ex. xvi. 33 B, 4 K. vi. 17 A, Is. xxx. 27 **א**, Ψ lxxiv. 9 R**א**$^{c.a}$, Sir. xlii. 16 B**א**.

(c) gen. sing. (πλήρους) Gen. xxvii. 27 ὡς ὀσμὴ ἀγροῦ πλήρης DE cursives (-ρους AM cursives)[1].

(d) nom. acc. plur. (πλήρεις) Gen. xli. 24 D, N. vii. 86 BF, Is. i. 15 Γ, li. 20 B, Jer. v. 27 **א**Q, Job xxxix. 2 B, W. v. 22 **א**, xi. 18 **א**, 3 M. vi. 31 V*.

(e) neut. plur. (πλήρη) N. vii. 13 F, 19 **א**, 79 B, Ψ cxliii. 13 R^{vid}, Job xxi. 24 τὰ δὲ ἔγκατα αὐτοῦ πλήρης στέατος B**א**AC with the parallel in Sir. xix. 26 τὰ δὲ ἐντὸς αὐτοῦ πλήρης δόλου B*C**א**$^{c.a}$ (A -ρεις: -ρη **א***B^{b}).

It will be seen that in the last two passages alone is there really strong authority for the indeclinable form and in Job πλήρης might partly be accounted for by the initial σ of the next word (cf. Mark iv. 28 πλήρης σῖτον with WH. App.). Several examples occur in Numbers, but it should be noted that in chap. vii which has 6 exx. of indeclinable πλ., there are 19 exx. without v.l. in the uncials of the declined forms.

Conversely, πλήρη=πλήρης Ez. xliii. 5 B*. The following are merely itacisms, which illustrate the tendency referred to above: πλήρεις=πλήρης (nom. sing.) 1 Ch. xxix. 28 A, Job vii. 4 B, Ψ xlvii. 11 B: πλῆρες=πλήρης Job xlii. 17 A: πλήρη=πλήρει 4 K. xx. 3 B.

7. **Εὐθής—εὐθύς.** In this word we find in the LXX a strange mixture of forms: the fem. of the old εὐθύς εὐθεῖα εὐθύ is retained, while the masc. and neuter in the singular are supplied by the new forms εὐθής -ές (like ἀληθής) and in the plural we meet with forms as from a nominative εὐθεῖος (like ἀνδρεῖος). The whole declension, so far as represented, runs as follows: the new forms are in thick type.

[1] And possibly in Is. lxiii. 3 (ὡς ἀπὸ πατητοῦ ληνοῦ) πλήρης καταπεπατημένης BAQ*: πλήρους is read by **א**Q^{mg}, and the Latin Fathers took πλ. as agreeing with ληνοῦ (see Ottley *in loc.*). It seems however preferable to take πλήρης as nom. beginning a fresh sentence, with ellipse of εἰμί.

Singular	M.	F.	N.
N.	εὐθής[1]	εὐθής[2] / εὐθεῖα[3]	εὐθές (-ής)[4] / εὐθύ[5]
A.	εὐθῆ (-ῆν)[6]	εὐθεῖαν	εὐθές
G.	εὐθοῦς[7]	εὐθείας	—
D.	—	εὐθείᾳ	—
Plural			
N.	εὐθεῖς	εὐθεῖαι	εὐθεῖα[8]
A.	εὐθεῖς	εὐθείας	εὐθεῖα[8] / (εὐθέα)
G.	εὐθ(ε)ίων[9]	—	—
D.	εὐθέσι(ν)	εὐθείαις	—

We cannot speak of two distinct words and say that the old εὐθύς forms, so far as preserved, are used in the literal sense and the new forms in the metaphorical sense of "straight," "upright," because the fem. forms -εῖα etc. are used in both senses. The fact is that the masc. and neut. sing. εὐθύς and εὐθύ together with εὐθέως (now indistinguishable from gen. εὐθέος) had become stereotyped as adverbs and it was felt that a new nom. for the adjective was required, and the analogy of ἀληθής plur. ἀληθεῖς suggested εὐθής as the proper singular for the old plural εὐθεῖς.

The new forms -ής -ῆ(ν) -οῦς have not yet been found in the papyri, and it is tempting, but would be hazardous, to conjecture that they were an invention of the later translators[10] to render the Hebrew יָשָׁר.

[1] 1 K. xxix. 6 etc. Εὐθύς only as a v.l. of A in Ψ xxiv. 8 (met. sense). In Ez. xxiii. 40 it is an adverb, incorrectly classified as an adj. in Hatch-Redpath.

[2] Ψ cxviii. 137 (ἡ κρίσις), Prov. xxvii. 21 a (καρδία).

[3] Jd. xiv. 3 B (ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς μου of a woman "well-pleasing"), 4 K. x. 15 and Ψ lxxvii. 37 (καρδία), Prov. xx. 14 etc. (ἡ ὁδός).

[4] Εὐθής 2 K. xix. 6 A, else εὐθές *passim*.

[5] Only in the phrase κατ' εὐθύ 3 K. xxi. 23, 25, Ez. xlvi. 9.

[6] 4 K. x. 3 (-ῆν A), Jdth x. 16 A, Eccl. vii. 30.

[7] 2 K. i. 18 βιβλίου τοῦ εὐθοῦς (the Book of the Upright or, neuter, of Uprightness).

[8] Ψ xviii. 9 (-έα B^b), lvii. 1, 2 Es. xix. 13 ℵA (-έα B), Dan. Θ xi. 17.

[9] Ψ cx. 1 εὐθίων ℵAT, cxi. 2 -ίων ℵT -είων A, Prov. xi. 3 A and 11 A -είων (probably Hexaplaric).

[10] They are absent from the Hexateuch (where יָשָׁר is rendered by ἀρεστός, δίκαιος and καλός) and not found in N.T.

In the plural, analogy again exercised its influence in another direction, probably first in the gen. plur., where the old distinction between εὐθέων—εὐθειῶν—εὐθέων could not long survive, and the fem. forms suggested masc. and neut. forms as from εὐθεῖος.

8. The intrusion of -ος forms into the neuter plural occurs in other adjectives in -ύς in LXX: βαρ(ε)ῖα 3 M. vi. 5 V (βαρέα A, and so Sir. xxix. 28): γλυκ(ε)ῖα Ψ cxviii. 103 ART ℵ$^{c.a}$ (γλυκέα ℵ*), Prov. xxvii. 7 ℵAC (γλυκέα B): ὀξ(ε)ῖα Is. v. 28 all uncials. (Βαθέα, on the other hand, is undisputed in Dan. OΘ ii. 22.) In N.T. cf. τὰ ἡμισ(ε)ῖα Lc. xix. 8.

In modern Greek the -ος forms have encroached still further and monopolized all cases of the plural and the gen. sing.[1] Codex A has one instance of gen. sing. in -ου viz. βαθέου Sir. xxii. 7 (βαθέος cett.), a variant which, although doubtless not the original reading, is interesting in this connexion.

9. The genitive singular of these adjectives in -ύς, though it has not yet gone over to the -ος class, has, however, in the vernacular begun to undergo a slight change, by taking over the long ω of the adverb: βαρέως 3 K. xii. 4 BA (but βαρέος 2 Ch. x. 4 BA): δασέως Dt. xii. 2 AF (-έος B), 2 Es. xviii. 15 ℵA^{a} (-έος BA*), Sir. xiv. 18 ℵA (-έος BC), Hb. iii. 3 ℵAQ* (-έος B).

In the literary 4 M. γλυκέος is undisputed (viii. 23) and βαθέος is no doubt the true reading in Sir. xxii. 7.

10. **Ἥμισυς** has lost the fem. forms in -εῖα altogether and adopted the κοινή contracted gen. sing. ἡμίσους (Att. ἡμίσεως)[2]. A word containing three vowels which came to be pronounced alike was specially liable to confusion and many of the peculiar LXX forms are due to mere 'itacism' (the equivalence of *ι* and *υ* sounds): but there are clear indications that ἥμισυ is be-

[1] See M. Gr. declension of βαθύς, Thumb *Handbuch* 47.

[2] Mayser 294 f., Moulton *CR* xv. 35^{a}. The papyri show one form not found in LXX, neut. pl. ἡμίση.

coming an indeclinable which may stand for all cases: ἥμισυς indecl. = gen. sing. seems also to deserve recognition. The LXX declension is as follows:

Singular	M. F.		N.
N. A.	—		ἥμισυ[1]
G.	(τοῦ and τῆς[2])	ἡμίσους ἥμισυς[3] ἡμίσεις[4] ἥμισυ[5] ἡμίσει[6]	
D.	(τῷ and τῇ[7])	ἡμίσει ἥμισυ[8]	
Plural			
N.	(οἱ) ἡμίσεις (οἱ) (ἡ)μίσει[9]		(τὰ) ἥμισυ[10]
A.	(τοὺς and τὰς[11]) ἡμίσεις		
D.	(τοῖς) ἡμίσεσιν[12] (τοῖς) ἡμίσει[13]		

11. The heterogeneous Attic πρᾶος πραεῖα πρᾶον has been reduced to uniformity by the employment throughout of the forms from -ύς (as in poetry): **πραύς**, πραύν[14], dat. sg. πραεῖᾳ

[1] Also written ἡμισου 3 K. iii. 25 B*, Is. xliv. 16 B*, and -σει Jos. xxii. 1 B*, 10 A, 11 B*A, 13 A, 21 A.

[2] 3 K. xvi. 9 τῆς ἡμίσους τῆς ἵππου.

[3] Ex. xxvii. 5 B*A ἕως (τοῦ) ἥμισυς, xxx. 15 A ἀπὸ τοῦ ἥμισυς, xxxviii. 1 A *bis*, N. xxxi. 30 B*, 1 Ch. vi. 71 A.

[4] Jos. xxi. 5 A, 1 Ch. xxvi. 32 BA (ἡμίσους Swete).

[5] Ex. xxx. 15 B ἀπὸ τοῦ ἥμισυ, Dan. Θ vii. 25 ἕως καιροῦ καὶ καιρῶν καί γε ἥμισυ καιροῦ.

[6] Jos. xxi. 6 A.

[7] 1 Ch. xxvii. 21 B τῇ ἡμίσει φυλῆς.

[8] N. xxxii. 33 BAF τῷ ἥμισυ φυλῆς, xxxiv. 13 F, Dt. iii. 13 B, xxix. 8 A, Jos. xii. 6 F, Dan. Θ ix. 27 BA, ib. A.

[9] Jos. ix. 6 F* οἱ μισει apparently = οἱ ἥμισυ (cf. M. Gr. μισυ μισός). The more idiomatic οἳ ἦσαν ἥμισυ of B is no doubt right.

[10] Tob. x. 10 BA? (τὸ ἥμ. A*vid).

[11] Ez. xvi. 51, 1 M. iii. 34, 37.

[12] Jos. xiii. 31.

[13] Jos. xxii. 7 A (= τοῖς ἥμισυ). In the same verse A has τοῖς ἡμισιν (sic) which may represent τ. ἡμίσεσιν or τ. ἡμισι (= ἥμισυ) with ν ἐφελκυστικόν. B has τῷ ἡμίσει in both places.

[14] Πρᾶον 2 M. xv. 12 A (πραύν V).

epithets for governors etc., like Ital. *-issimo*, abound: the most frequent are *μέγιστος*, *κράτιστος*, *λαμπρότατος*, *ἱερώτατος*.

14. In LXX superlatives in **-τατος** are not so rare as in N.T., where Blass finds only two instances, but they occur for the most part in the literary books (Wis., 2—4 Macc., Prov., Est.) and often in elative sense.

The following exx. have been noted in the less literary books. Genesis has several true superlatives: *φρονιμώτατος* (*πάντων*) iii. 1, *ἐνδοξότατος* (*πάντων*) xxxiv. 19, *νεώτατος* xlix. 22 (for the more usual *νεώτερος*). In Jd. xi. 35 A *ἐμπεποδεστάτη* (!) *καὶ σεμνοτάτη* the text is a curious perversion of *ἐμπεποδεστάτηκας ἐμέ* (see Field's Hex.). *Ὑψηλοτάτη* (*καὶ μεγάλη*) 3 K. iii. 4 (elative). *Ὁ μικρότατος* 2 Ch. xxi. 17 (true superlative: usually *ὁ μικρός* in this sense, as ib. xxii. 1).

In the literary books forms in *-έστατος* are common: Wis. alone has *ἀδρανέστατος* xiii. 19, *ἀληθέστατος* vi. 17, *ἀπηνέστατος* xvii. 19, *ἀτελέστατος* iv. 5 A, *ἀφρονέστατος* xv. 14 BA: Prov. has e.g. *ἀφρονέστατος* ix. 16, x. 18, xxiv. 25, *ἐπιφανέστατα* xxv. 14. 4 M. (and to some extent 2 M.) is fond of using comp. and superl. of compound words, e.g. *περιεκτικώτατος*, *πολυτροπώτερος* (*-τατος*), *φιλοτεκνώτερος*, *ἀνοητότερον*. Job (vi. 15, xix. 14) has *οἱ ἐγγύτατοί μου*, for which the other books write (*οἱ*) *ἔγγιστά μου*, e.g. Ψ xxxvii. 12: both are classical.

15. The termination *-αίτερος* does not occur, unless it is to be found in *πλησιέτερον* (=*-αίτ.*) 4 M. xii. 3 ℵ: *πλησιότερον* of V* shows the tendency to revert to the normal form: *πλησιέστερον* of A has other late attestation and may be right.

16. The Attic rule as to long or short *ο* before *-τερος -τατος* is usually observed. The vowel preceding mute + nasal (liquid) is regarded as short, contrary to Attic practice, in *φιλοτἔκνώτεραι* 4 M. xv. 5 AℵV*: cf. *ἐλἄφρώτερος* Job vii. 6 B*ℵ*, ix. 25 B*. Phonetic changes (*αι* = *ε*, interchange of *ῐ*, *ῑ* and *ο*, *ω*) account for other irregularities. The latest LXX book again affords an example: *ἀνδρειωτέρα* 4 M. xv. 30 AV* (ℵ *ἀνδριωτ.*): similarly *παλαιωτέρων* Est. E 7 A (*-οτ.* Bℵ) and *παλαιώτατος* 3 times in the colophon at the end of Esther written by correctors of ℵ (strict Attic *παλαίτερος -αίτατος*). The converse is seen in *συνετότερος* Gen. xli. 39 E, *κυριότατος* 4 M. i. 19 A: cf. *ἀθλειοτάτης* 3 M. v. 49 A.

17. *Adjectival comparative and superlative of Adverbs.* Forms in *-τερος -τατος* are now augmented by some new adjectives—*ἐξώτερος -τατος, ἐσώτερος -τατος*[1]—which replace to some extent the classical adverbial forms in *-τέρω -τάτω*. Of these latter the only exx. are *τὴν Βαιθωρὰμ τὴν ἀνωτέρω* 3 K. x. 23 B and *κατωτάτω* read by ℵ in Tob. iv. 19, xiii. 2, by B in Ψ cxxxviii. 15, by A in Job xxxvii. 12. For the comparison of the adverb the *κοινή* preferred neut. sing. and plur. forms in *-τερον -τατα*: the former occur in LXX, where they are hardly distinguishable from the simple adv. or prep.—*ἀνώτερον* (= *ἄνω*) L. xi. 21 *ἔχει σκέλη ἀνώτερον τῶν ποδῶν*, 2 Es. xiii. 28: *κατώτερον* (= *κάτω*) Gen. xxxv. 8 AE *ἀπέθανεν δὲ Δ. κατ. Βαιθήλ*: *ἐσώτερον* (= *ἔσω*) Ex. xxvi. 33, L. xvi. 2, 12, 15, 1 K. xxiv. 4, Is. xxii. 11.

The use of the comp. here may be accounted for by the presence of מִן in the Heb.: *ἀνώτερον* = ממעל, *κατ.* = מתחת, *ἐσ.* = מבית.

Whereas the comparative usually encroaches upon the sphere of the superlative, the reverse takes place with *πρῶτος*, which, besides being used in superlative or elative sense, begins to supplant *πρότερος*. So e.g. Gen. xli. 20 *κατέφαγον αἱ ἑπτὰ βόες αἱ αἰσχραὶ...τὰς πρώτας τὰς καλάς*, Ex. iv. 8 *τοῦ σημείου τοῦ πρώτου...τοῦ σημ. τοῦ ἐσχάτου* (*former* and *latter*), xxxiv. 1 *δύο πλάκας λιθίνας καθὼς καὶ αἱ πρῶται* (cf. 4), Dt. x. 1 ff., Jd. xx. 32 B *ὡς τὸ πρῶτον* (= A *καθὼς ἔμπροσθεν*), Tob. xiv. 5 ℵ *οἰκοδομήσουσιν τὸν οἶκον καὶ οὐχ ὡς τὸν πρῶτον* (– BA *οὐχ οἷος ὁ πρότερος*). Πρότερος, though not half so frequent as *πρῶτος*, is still well represented, mainly by the adverb (*τὸ*) *πρότερον* and by the classical use of the adjective in place of the adverb, as in Ex. x. 14 *προτέρα αὐτῆς οὐ γέγονεν τοιαύτη ἀκρὶς καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα κ.τ.λ.* This use of *πρότερος* = *πρό* may have assisted in

[1] Apparently first found in LXX: *ἀνώτερος -τατος, κατώτερος -τατος* have some classical authority. Cod. A has a similar comparative adj. from *ἐντός*: Est. iv. 11 *τὴν αὐλὴν τὴν* **ἐντοτέραν** (*ἐσωτέραν* Bℵ).

producing *πρῶτος* = *πρότερος*. **Ἔσχατος** is similarly used both for superl. and comp.: Dt. xxiv. 3 *γένηται ἀνδρὶ ἑτέρῳ καὶ μισήσῃ αὐτὴν ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ ἔσχατος*, Jos. x. 14 *οὐκ ἐγένετο ἡμέρα τοιαύτη οὐδὲ τὸ πρότερον οὐδὲ τὸ ἔσχατον*[1]: *ἔσχατον* is used as a preposition "after" in Dt. xxxi. 27, 29, *ἔσχατον τοῦ θανάτου* (*τῆς τελευτῆς*) *μου*, *ἔσχ. τῶν ἡμερῶν*.

Ὕστερος (apart from the adverbial *ὕστερον*, *ἐφ' ὑστέρῳ*, *ἐξ ὑστέρου*) occurs once only (1 Ch. xxix. 29), where it is a true comparative: *ὕστατος* (= superl.) is also represented by a solitary instance (3 M. v. 49).

18. In modern Greek the old forms in *-ίων -ιστος* have been ousted by others in *-τερος -τατος* (e.g. *καλύτερος*, *χερότερος* for *καλλίων*, *χείρων*)[2]. In the LXX we see but the beginnings of this transition. *Αἰσχρότερος* (for *αἰσχίων*) Gen. xli. 19 may be illustrated from a papyrus of iii/B.C.[3] The vulgar *ἀγαθώτερος*[4] is confined to the late B text of Judges (xi. 25, xv. 2: A *κρείσσων bis*).

19. *Ταχύ* has the comparative of the earlier period of the *κοινή*, *τάχιον*, in W. xiii. 9, 1 M. ii. 40: 2 Macc. alone has class. *θᾶττον* (iv. 31, v. 21, xiv. 11: used with positive or elative sense).

Ταχύτερον, found in papyri of ii/iii/A.D., has not yet made its appearance: nor does the LXX afford examples of double forms like *μειζότερος*.

20. Many of the classical forms in *-ιων -ιστος* are retained, but few are frequent, and the superlatives are mainly confined to the literary books and used in elative sense.

[1] Cf. more doubtful cases in R. iii. 10, 2 K. xiii. 15 B (*μείζων ἡ κακία ἡ ἐσχ. ἢ ἡ πρώτη*, a gloss, possibly of Christian origin), Hg. ii. 9, Dan. ΟΘ xi. 29. A sentence like (2 M. vii. 41) *ἐσχάτη δὲ τῶν υἱῶν ἡ μήτηρ ἐτελεύτησεν* has of course classical warrant.

[2] Thumb *Handbuch* 51.

[3] Mayser 298. The superl. *αἴσχιστος* occurs as a variant for *ἔχθιστος* in Est. E. 24 A, 3 M. iii. 27 V.

[4] *Ἀγαθώτατος* in an undated letter (A.D.), Par. xviii. 3.

Πλείων is frequent, often without comp. force as in the common phrases *ἡμέρας πλείους* L. xv. 25 etc. (=*ἡμ. πολλάς* elsewhere) and *ἐπὶ πλεῖον* (=*ἐπὶ πολύ*) Ψ l. 4 etc.

Μείζων occurs sporadically.

Πλεῖστος occurs sporadically as a true superl., or in elative sense (e.g. Sir. xlv. 9 *χρυσοῖς κώδωσιν πλείστοις*, l. 18 *ἐν πλείστῳ οἴκῳ* R.V. "in the whole house" [*ἤχῳ* should perhaps be read], Is. vii. 22 *πλεῖστον γάλα*).

Μέγιστος is literary and usually elative as an attribute of *θεός* (e.g. 2 M. iii. 36, 3 M. i. 9 V).

Ἄριστος literary and elative (4 M. vii. 1).

Ἄμ(ε)ινον only as a v.l. of ℵ in Est. E. 2 (=BA *μεῖζον*).

Βελτίων is fairly frequent (several times in Jer. *β*).

Βέλτιστος in Pent. and literary books (Gen. xlvii. 6, 11, Ex. xxii. 5 *bis*: 2 M. xiv. 30, 3 M. iii. 26).

Κρείσσων is the most frequent comp. form of *ἀγαθός*.

Κράτιστος occurs as a true superl. in literary books (2, 3 M.) and elsewhere: 1 K. xv. 15, Ψ xv. 6, xxii. 5, Am. vi. 2.

Ἐλάσσων is used in Pent. (Gen. i. 16 etc., Ex. xvi. 17 f., L. xxv. 16, N. xxvi. 54 etc.) and the literary books.

Ἐλάχιστος also is not confined to the literary books: as a true superl. in Jos. vi. 26 *bis* (opposed to *πρωτότοκος*), 1 K. ix. 21, 4 K. xviii. 24, Jer. xxix. 21: as elative e.g. *ἐλαχίστῳ ξύλῳ*, "a diminutive piece of wood," W. xiv. 5.

Ἥσσων Is. xxiii. 8 and in literary books (usually in the phrases *οὐδὲν* [*οὐχ*] *ἧττον*).

Χείρων 1 K. xvii. 43 B and literary.

[Ἥκιστος is not used.]

Χείριστος literary, used as true superl. (Est. B. 5, 2 and 3 M.).

Ἔσχατος literary.

Μᾶλλον is fairly common.

Μάλιστα is literary (2—4 M.).

Ὀλιγοστός, apparently a *κοινή* offshoot from *πολλοστός*[1] (like *πόστος*, *εἰκοστός*), is fairly common in LXX, with the proper etymological meaning of "one of few," "attended by a small retinue," e.g. Gen. xxxiv. 30 *ὀλ. εἰμι ἐν ἀριθμῷ*, 1 M. iii. 16 *ἐξῆλθεν Ἰούδας...ὀλιγοστός*, but sometimes hardly distinguishable from *ὀλίγος*, "few," "inferior." The converse *πολλοστός* is classical in the sense of "one of many," "(a) very small (fraction)" or "one of *οἱ πολλοί*," "plebeian": in LXX it occurs twice only and then with the opposite meaning of "great," "powerful" (=*πολύς*): 2 K. xxiii. 20 *ἀνὴρ αὐτὸς πολλοστὸς ἔργοις*, Prov. v. 19 (by conjugal fidelity) *πολλοστὸς ἔσῃ*.

[1] In Soph. *Ant.* 625 Jebb reads *ὀλίγιστον χρόνον*.

21. As regards the *declension* of comparatives in *-ων*, the shorter Attic forms in *-ω -ους* of acc. sing. and nom. and acc. plur., which show signs of waning in ii/i/B.C.[1], are still well represented in LXX.

Βελτίων, ἐλάσσων, κρείσσων have the shorter forms only in the cases concerned. Βελτίους Prov. xxiv. 40, Job xlii. 15, Jer. xxxiii. 13, βελτίω ib. xlii. 15 ℵ (the variants show the tendency to introduce the longer form: βελτίων B*, -ιον A, -ίονα Q). Τὸν ἐλάσσω Gen. i. 16, xxvii. 6, οὐκ ἐλάττους 2 M. v. 5, viii. 9, xii. 10. Τόπον...κρείττω Is. lvi. 5 (with v.ll. κρείττων Γ, κρ(ε)ίσσων ℵA, κρισσον Q), neut. plur. κρείσσω Prov. viii. 19 B (κρίσσων ℵ, κρισσον A) and κρείττω Ep. J. 67 B (κρίσσων A, κρείσσονα Q), κρείσσους Prov. xxvii. 5.—On the other hand ἥττων has the longer forms only: ἥττονα Ep. J. 35, ἥττονες Job xx. 10.—In other words both forms occur. Πλείων has πλείονα in sing. and plur. (once only the shorter form: 1 Es. iv. 42 πλείω τῶν γεγραμμένων): but πλείους is usual (constant in the phrase ἡμέρας πλείους), though πλείονες -ας occur: 2 Ch. xxxii. 7, Jer. xliii. 32, Ez. xxix. 15, 2 M. xi. 12 (Dt. xx. 19 A, 1 Ch. iv. 40 A, Ep. J. 18 A). Μείζονες -ονας -ονα (neut. plur.) only are attested: the acc. sing. is μείζονα in Dan. O xi. 13, μ(ε)ίζω in 3 K. xi. 19 A (τῆς μείζω[2] B) and probably this stood in 4 M. xv. 9 (μείζων AV, μιζον ℵ*, μίζω ℵ[c.a]). Χείρων has acc. sing. χείρονα 3 M. v. 20 (in 1 K. xvii. 43 Οὐχί, ἀλλ' ἢ χείρω[2] κυνός, the nom. must be meant): the neut. plur. is χείρονα in W. xv. 18, but χείρω ib. xvii. 6.

§ 13. The Numerals.

1. Δύο in LXX, as in the papyri[3], N.T., and the κοινή generally, has gen. δύο and dative δυσί(ν), on the analogy of τρισί(ν). The indeclinable use of δύο for both gen. and dat. (as well as acc.) has classical authority: δυσί(ν) was, however, the normal dative from Aristotle onwards. Δύο for dat. occurs in LXX in the A text of Jos. vi. 22 (AF), xiii. 8, Jd. xv. 13, 3 K. xxii. 31, and so apparently ib. xvi. 24 BA (ἐν δύο ταλάντων ἀργυρίου): cf. Sir. xliv. 23 ἐν φυλαῖς...δέκα δύο. The old dual

[1] Mayser 298 f.: the Atticists gave them a new lease of life.

[2] The -ω forms are often used (like πλήρης, ἥμισυ) indeclinably: Moulton *Prol.* 50.

[3] Mayser 313 f. (from end of ii/B.C.).

is preserved in two literary books in the debased form, found in Polybius and the Atticists, δυεῖν (§ 6, 37): 4 M. i. 28 ℵV (δυοῖν A), xv. 2, Job ix. 33 A = xiii. 20 A δυεῖν δέ μοι χρ(ε)ία (or χρήσῃ Bℵ in the latter passage, meaning apparently "treat" or "indulge me in two ways").

2. For the usual declension of nom. and acc. of τέσσαρες in the LXX uncials viz.:

N. τέσσαρες τέσσερα,
A. τέσσαρες τέσσερα,

see §§ 5, p. 62, 6. 2, 10. 15. The gen. and, as a rule, the dat. take the Attic forms (τεσσάρων, τέσσαρσι(ν)). Assimilation of syllables, apparently, produces the spelling of the dat. as τέρσαρ-σιν in the opening chapters of Amos in Cod. A (i. 9, 11, ii. 1): the same MS has the metaplastic τεσσάροις once in Ez. i. 10 (but τέσσαρσι twice in same *v.*): the alternative dat. τέτρασιν (poetical and late prose)[1] occurs once in Jd. ix. 34 B τέτρασιν ἀρχαῖς.

3. To express numbers between ten and twenty the classical language usually placed the smaller number first. So always ἕνδεκα, δώδεκα, the composite forms attesting their antiquity: the component parts of the higher numbers were linked by καί (τρεισκαίδεκα etc.). But, in certain circumstances, viz. where the substantive stood before the numeral, the order was reversed, the larger number preceding: the insertion or omission of the copula was optional. In the κοινή the second method (without copula) prevailed and in modern Greek, for numbers above twelve, has become universal. It was natural that the order of the symbols (ιγ΄ etc.) should ultimately determine the order of the words when written in full. But ἕνδεκα (mod. Gr. ἕντ.) δώδεκα had taken too deep root to be dislodged and have survived to the present day.

Δεκάδυο was a short-lived attempt to displace the latter, which appears to have been much in vogue in the Ptolemaic

[1] Exx. in Crönert 199 note 2.

age[1]. In LXX, as against numerous examples of δώδεκα, δεκάδυο has good authority throughout two books only, viz. 1 Chron. (vi. 63 BA, ix. 22 BA, xv. 10 BA, xxv. 9 ff. B: so 2 Ch. xxxiii. 1 BA, but elsewhere δώδ.) and Judith (ii. 5, 15, vii. 2): elsewhere it receives good support in 2 Es. ii. 6 BA, 18 BA, Sir. xliv. 23 BA and occurs sporadically in B (Ex. xxviii. 21, xxxvi. 21: Jos. xviii. 24, xxi. 40: 4 K. i. 18 a: 1 Es. viii. 35, 54, 63) and, less often, in A.

For 'the teens' the LXX uncials attest the two classical modes of expression (τρ(ε)ισκαίδεκα, δεκατρ(ε)ῖς etc.) in about equal proportions, the latter slightly preponderating.

Occasionally in Genesis, contrary to classical precedent, the copula is inserted with the latter order of words: Gen. xiv. 14 δέκα καὶ ὀκτώ AD, xxxi. 41 δ. καὶ τέσσ., xxxvii. 2 δ. καὶ ἑπτά E, xlvi. 22 δ. καὶ ἐννέα D: so 3 K. vii. 40 A, 1 Ch. xxvi. 9, 2 Ch. xxvi. 1. A, where it does not use δεκαέξ, always writes ἓξ καὶ δέκα, as distinct words: B, except in N. xxxi. 46, 52, writes ἑκκαίδεκα.

4. For numbers above 'the teens' there is no fixed order in LXX, but the tendency is to write the larger number first. The literary 2 Macc. employs πρός with dative for large numbers e.g. v. 21 ὀκτακόσια πρὸς τοῖς χιλίοις, v. 24 V δισμυρίοις πρὸς τοῖς χιλ., x. 31 δισμύριοι πρὸς τοῖς πεντακοσίοις etc. (poetical, cf. Aesch. *P.V.* 774 τρίτος...πρὸς δέκ' ἄλλαισιν γοναῖς, Soph. *Trach.* 45).

5. The *ordinals* retain their place[2]. The strict Attic forms to express 13th—19th—separate declinable words, τρίτος καὶ δέκατος etc.—have been entirely supplanted by the composite words τρισκαιδέκατος etc. (rare in classical Greek, possibly of Ionic origin). The former only survive as variants in 2 M. xi. 33 V πέμπτῃ καὶ δεκάτῃ, Est. ix. 21 $\aleph^{c.a}$ πέμπτην καὶ δεκάτην[3].

[1] Mayser (316) notes only one example of δώδεκα (157 B.C.). On the other hand in the ostraca δώδεκα predominates (Moulton *Prol.*[2] 246). Cod. Bezae writes only δέκα δύο or ιβ (ib. 96).

[2] All above τέταρτος have disappeared from the modern language.

[3] The -τε of πέντε, recalling -τος, perhaps accounts for the tendency in this case: cf. 1 Ch. xxiv. 14 πεμπτεκαιδέκατος *sic* B*.

The form τρισκαιδέκατος, always so written in LXX, for the more correct τρεισκ., has, by analogy, produced the still more impossible form τεσσαρισκαιδέκατος (2 Ch. xxx. 15 B*^{b}A and constantly elsewhere in one or more correctors of B) for τεσσαρεσκαιδέκατος. The ordinals between 20 and 30, 30 and 40 etc. are expressed in Attic by two ordinals connected by καί (δεύτερος καὶ εἰκοστός etc.), except for εἷς καὶ (εἰκοστός): the cardinal is similarly used in this instance in LXX (1 Ch. xxiv. 17 ὁ εἷς καὶ εἰκοστός, 1 M. vii. 1 ἔτους ἑνὸς καὶ πεντηκοστοῦ: and so, with irregular order, Jer. lii. 1 εἰκοστοῦ καὶ ἑνὸς ἔτους, 2 Ch. xvi. 13 A), but we also meet with 3 K. xvi. 23 τριακοστῷ καὶ πρώτῳ, 1 Ch. xxv. 28 εἰκοστὸς πρῶτος, 2 M. xiv. 4 πρώτῳ καὶ ἑκατοστῷ καὶ πεντηκοστῷ (where the order is peculiar). In these compound ordinals the smaller number usually precedes as in Attic, but in the later portions of the LXX, there is a marked tendency to reverse this order, and thus to bring cardinals (whether expressed by words or symbols) and ordinals into line[1].

6. To express certain *days of the month* (the 4th, 20th and 30th) classical Greek employed, in place of the ordinals, the substantives τετράς, εἰκάς, τριακάς. These are retained in the LXX proper[2], but appear to have been unfamiliar to Theodotion and his school: Dan. Θ x. 4 = 2 Es. xix. 1 ἐν ἡμέρᾳ εἰκοστῇ καὶ τετάρτῃ τοῦ μηνός (contrast e.g. 2 M. xi. 21 Διὸς Κορινθίου τετράδι καὶ εἰκάδι).

Τετάρτη appears also (beside εἰκάς) in Dan. O x. 4, 3 M. vi. 38, εἰκοστῇ is read by B in 2 Ch. vii. 10 (εἰκάδι A).

7. The *numeral adverbs* continue in use: for ἑπτάκι (-κις)

[1] E.g. 4 K. xiii. 10 ἐν ἔτει τριακοστῷ καὶ ἑβδόμῳ. So regularly in 4 K., 2 Es., Dan. Θ (x. 4) and Jer. lii. (verses 1 and 31): also Jos. xiv. 10, 1 M. i. 10, 20 (the dates in the later chapters follow the Attic order), 2 M. i. 10 and (without copula) xi. 21, 33, 38.

[2] Τριακάς 2 M. xi. 30, the other two frequently. Τετράς in Ψ xciii. tit. is used of the fourth day of the *week*, τετράδι σαββάτων (-του), as in modern Greek.

see § 9, 9. Aquila and his school employ in place of them the plural of *κάθοδος* to render the Heb. פעמים (lit. strokes, beats): from this source in "LXX" come 3 K. ix. 25 A *τρεῖς καθόδους*, Eccl. vii. 23 b *καθόδους πολλάς* (= *πλειστάκις* in the doublet 23 a): cf. in mod. Greek *μιὰ φορά, τρεῖς φορές*.

§ 14. Pronouns.

1. **Personal.** The 3rd pers. is represented by *αὐτοῦ* etc., including (at least in some books) the nom. *αὐτός, αὐτοί*.

'Απέριψάς με εἰς βάθη Jon. ii. 4 ℵ, if not a mere slip, may be compared with *οὕτω(ς)* etc. I have not noted in LXX any exx. of the longer modern Greek forms *ἐσύ* etc.: *μετ' ἐσοῦ* occurs in papyri of ii/A.D. (OP iii. 528, 531, Par. 18).

2. **Reflexives.** 'Εμαυτ(οῦ), σεαυτ(οῦ), ἑαυτ(οῦ) remain in use, the last two usually in the longer forms preferred by the *κοινή*: the alternative Attic forms *σαυτοῦ, αὑτοῦ*, which are absent from the N.T. (Blass 35), continue to be written in the papyri down to about the end of ii/B.C.[1], and are sporadically represented in the LXX.

Σαυτ(οῦ) in Pentateuch only in Dt. xxi. 11 B (cf. xix. 9 προσθησεισαγτω B*vid., *-σεις σαυτῷ* Swete): frequently in the Kingdom books, 1 K. xix. 11 B, 2 K. ii. 21 B *semel*, 3 K. iii. 5 B, 11 BA *bis*, viii. 53 *bis* (BA, B), xvii. 13 BA, xx. 7 BA, xxi. 34 BA, 4 K. iv. 3 B, vi. 7 B, xviii. 21 BA, 23 A, 24 B: Ez. iv. 9 B *semel* (c'αγτω *sic*), xvi. 52 Q, xxxiii. 9 B, xxxvii. 17 BQ, xxxviii. 7 Q: elsewhere Ψ liv. 11 B, Tob. vi. 5 ℵ, Sir. xiv. 11 A, Is. viii. 1 ℵ. For *αὐτοῦ* etc. we find e.g. 2 Ch. xxi. 8 B *ἐφ' αὑτούς*, 1 M. iii. 13 A, *μεθ' αὑτοῦ* (*μετ' αὐτ.* ℵV): of course in many cases it is uncertain whether *αὑτ.* or *αὐτ.* is intended.

'Εαυτ(οῦ) for 1st or 2nd pers. sing. is an illiteracy found occasionally as a v.l.: *ἑαυτοῦ* = *ἐμαυτοῦ* Job xxxii. 6 C, *ἑαυτῷ* = *σεαυτῷ* Job x. 13 A* fort ℵc.a, Is. xxi. 6 ℵ (see Moulton *Prol.* 87).

The corresponding use of the *plural* *ἑαυτῶν*, on the other hand, is normal in the *κοινή*. It had already since c. 400 B.C. supplanted *σφῶν αὐτῶν*[2], and from ii/B.C. in the papyri further

[1] Mayser 305 ff. [2] Meisterhans 153.

supplants *ἡμῶν* and *ὑμῶν αὐτῶν*[1]. So in LXX the 1st pers. plur. is always and the 2nd pers. usually *ἑαυτ(ῶν)*. The Hexateuch, however, a production of iii/B.C., retains the old *ὑμ(ῶν) αὐτ(ῶν)* together with what appears to be a transitional form **ὑμῖν ἑαυτοῖς**: the latter might be merely due to mixture of readings, but its frequent attestation and the limitation of this form of reflexive to the dat. of the 2nd plur. are against this.

Ἑαυτ(ῶν): (a)=*ἡμ. αὐτ.*: Gen. xliii. 22, Jos. xxii. 23 (*αὐτοῖς* B), 1 K. xiv. 9 etc.: (b)=*ὑμ. αὐτ.* Ex. xix. 12 BA, Dt. i. 13 BA, Jos. iv. 3 F, ix. 17 BA and frequently in later books.

Ὑμῶν *αὐτῶν* Ex. xxxv. 5 and frequently in Dt. in the phrase *ἐξαρεῖς* (*ἀφανιεῖς*) *ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν* (*τὸν πονηρόν*): Dt. xiii. 5, xvii. 7, xix. 19 (*-αρεῖτε* AF), xxi. 9, 21, xxii. 21, 24, xxiv. 7, cf. Jos. vii. 12 (*ἐξάρητε*): the Heb. מקרבך "from thy midst" if literally rendered *ἐκ σεαυτοῦ* would have conveyed another meaning, that of exorcism.

Ὑμῖν *αὐτοῖς* with variants *ὑμῖν ἑαυτοῖς* and *ἑαυτοῖς*. Ex. xix. 12 F *ὑμ. ἑαυτ.*, xx. 23[a] *ὑμ. αὐτ.* B (*ἑαυτ.* AF), 23[b] *ὑμ. αὐτ.* A (*ὑμ. ἑ.* BF), xxx. 32 *οὐ ποιηθήσεται* (A *ποιήσεται*) *ὑμῖν ἑαυτοῖς* BAF, xxx. 37 *ὑμ. αὐτ.* BF (*ὑμ. ἑ.* A): Dt. iv. 16 and 23 *ὑμ. ἑ.* B (*ὑμ. αὐτ.* AF): Jos. iv. 3 *ἅμα ὑμῖν αὐτ.* AF (*ἅμα ὑμῖν καὶ αὐτοῖς* B), ix. 17 F *ὑμ. αὐτ.* (*ἑαυτοῖς* BA), xxii. 16 *ὑμ. ἑ.* B (*ἑαυτοῖς* A), xxiv. 15 *ὑμ. ἑ.* B (*ὑμ. αὐτ.* A). [The following are not reflexive: Jos. vi. 18 *ὑμεῖς αὐτοί* B (*ὑμεῖς* AF) "even you": 2 Ch. xx. 15 *τάδε λέγει Κύριος ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς* "to *you*," Heb. אתם לכם, אתם forming part of the Lord's words.]

3. **Demonstratives.** Under Accidence there is little to note. Οὗτος and *ἐκεῖνος* are used regularly: *ὅδε* is much commoner than in N.T., most often in the phrase *τάδε λέγει Κύριος* and the like, but also elsewhere, in the Pentateuch with correct deictic force idiomatically rendering Heb. הִנֵּה = *voici*, e.g. Gen. l. 18 *οἵδε ἡμεῖς σοι οἰκέται*: but it is going over to the literary class and in some books is used incorrectly for *οὗτος*. The intensive *-ί* with *οὗτος* is unrepresented, but *νυνί* occurs in literary books (Job, 2 and 4 M., Ψ xvi. 11, xliii. 10).

[1] Mayser 303: the beginnings of this use of *ἑαυτῶν* go back to Attic Greek. Polybius never has the old forms but only *αὐτῶν αὐτούς* (for 1st and 2nd pers.) and *ἑαυτοῖς* (2nd pers.): Kälker 277. Mayser cites no exx. of reflex. 1st and 2nd plur. in any form for iii/B.C.

4. **Relatives.** Ὅς ἥ ὅ is frequent: ὅστις ἥτις ὅ,τι (fem. ΗΣΤΙΣ Jer. vi. 8 ℵ) is less so, and the distinction between the pronouns is not always rigidly observed. The latter, apart from ἥστινος 2 M. v. 10, and the phrases ἕως (μέχρι) ὅτου, is confined to the nom. sing. and plur. and the neut. acc. sing. ὅ,τι. The shorter forms are found only in the phrases quoted: the shorter forms of the interrogative and indefinite pronouns (τοῦ, τῷ, του, τῳ) do not occur. Ὅσπερ in neut. sing. and plur. is literary (5 times in all: in Lev. xxv. 27 read ὃ ὑπερέχει with B^{ab}, in Jos. xxiii. 4 ἐπέρ(ρ)ιφα with A, in 2 K. vi. 8 ὑπὲρ οὗ).

5. **Correlatives.** The following occur. Ποῖος—τοιοῦτος (τοῖος 2 Es. v. 3: τοιόσδε 2 M. xi. 27, xv. 12)—οἷος—ὁποῖος (lit.) 2 M. xi. 37 and in the 'stage-direction' in Cant. v. 10 ℵ. Πόσος—τοσοῦτος (τόσῳ μᾶλλον Sir. xi. 11, xiii. 9)—ὅσος. Πηλίκος Zech. ii. 2 *bis*, 4 M. xv. 22—τηλικοῦτος (lit.: 2—4 M.). Ποταπός only in Dan. O Sus. 54, where it keeps something of its original local meaning, ποτ. τοῦ παραδείσου τόπῳ. (Ὁπόσος, ἡλίκος are unrepresented.)

Τοιοῦτος has neuter in -ο (-ον 2 K. xiv. 13 A, 1 Es. i. 19 B) as also τηλικοῦτος: τοσοῦτος has neut. in -ο in vernacular style (N. xv. 5, 1 M. iii. 17), in -ον in the literary books (Est. E. 7, 11, W. xiii. 9, 2 and 3 M.): both forms are old.

6. Words indicating *duality* as distinct from plurality are disappearing: ἀμφότεροι (not ἄμφω) and ἕτερος alone are frequent (μηθέτερος Prov. xxiv. 21). Ἑκάτερος is correctly used for "one of two" in Gen. xl. 5, Tob. ℵ v. 3 (read ἑκάτερος ἕν), xi. 13 and in the literary books (so ἑκατέρωθεν 4 M.), in Ez. it appears to take the place of ἕκαστος: elsewhere ἕκαστος supplants it, ἕκαστος itself being replaced in the literal books by ἄνθρωπος or ἀνήρ (p. 45). Πότερος is supplanted by τίς, appearing only in Job as an interrogative particle (πότερον).

§ 15. The Verb. General Changes in Conjugation.

1. The verbal system to a large extent remains unaltered, but in more than one direction shows signs of the shrinkage or retrenchment and the reduction of what appeared to be superfluous varieties to a uniform pattern which characterize the later language as a whole.

Thus, the old three *classes of verbs*—barytones in -ω, contracts, verbs in -μι—have already gone far on the way to being merged into two, since the -μι verbs have in the active in large measure passed over to the -ω class, while the beginnings of a similar amalgamation of three forms into two may be traced in the occasional confusion in the uncials of contract verbs in -άω and -έω (§ 22, 1).

The three *voices* remain as before, but a tendency to eliminate, as in modern Greek, from the middle the only tenses which discriminated it from the passive (1st aorist and future) may be inferred from the more extended use of the aorist passive of deponent verbs (*ἀπεκρίθην*, *ἐγενήθην* etc., § 21, 6), and perhaps also from the partial substitution of the future active for the future middle which Attic writers preferred in certain quasi-deponent verbs denoting a physical action or an emotion (*ἀκούσω*, *βλέψω*, *θαυμάσω* etc., § 20, 3).

2. As regards the *moods*, the optative, which is defunct in the modern language, is still commonly used to express a wish: other uses viz. with *ἄν* in principal sentences (questions etc.) to express possibility and in subordinate clauses (conditional, final etc.) are rare except in the literary essay known as 4 Maccabees, which uses it freely[1]. The conjunctive is still

[1] Further instances occur not only in literary versions or writings such as Job, Proverbs, 2 Maccabees and the Epistle of Jeremiah, but also in the Pentateuch (especially in comparisons with *ὡς εἰ* or simply *ὡς*), Psalms and elsewhere. The mood thus appears still to show some signs of life in the vernacular of the Ptolemaic age, whereas in N. T. writings it is always an index of a cultivated writer. In its primary use it is occasionally, especially in late texts, replaced by the conj., e.g. Ex. xxxiii. 13 *γνωστῶς ἴδω σε*, Jd. ix. 15 B *ἐξέλθῃ πῦρ...καὶ καταφάγῃ*, Job xxxi. 40 A *ἐξέλθῃ* etc.

frequent, but shows signs of shrinkage in the use of the indicative (imperfect and fut.) after particles such as *ἐάν*, *ὅταν*, *ἵνα*: in other connexions the mixture of conj. and fut. ind. is common, largely owing to changes in pronunciation such as the equalization of *ω* and *ο*. The imperative remains but, through the influence of the Hebrew, is often replaced in the second person by the future indicative. The infinitive (defunct in the modern language) is in vigorous life and shows no signs of decay, the anarthrous and the now popular articular form of it being both widely represented: the modern substitution of a clause with *ἵνα* (*νά*) can hardly be paralleled from the LXX. The inf. and participle of the future are not often met with outside literary books. The verbal adjective in forms which have become stereotyped as adjectives (*αἰνετός* "praiseworthy," *δεκτός*, *θελητός* etc.) is not uncommon[1]: forms in *-έον* used as the main verb in the sentence seem to be limited to the Epistle of Jeremiah, which has *νομιστέον* 39, 56, *κλητέον* 39, *γνωστέον* 51, *ἐκδεκτέον* 56: cf. *ἀναλημπτέα* 2 M. iii. 13.

3. Turning to the *tense* system, we find new forms of the present evolved out of the perfect (*γρηγορέω* etc.) and aorist (*κρύβω*): the partiality of the language for terminations of the present such as *-νω* (*ἱστάνω*, *λιμπάνω* etc.) and its lavish creation of new verbs in *-άζω* and *-ίζω* belong to the department of word-formation. The future drops certain forms now regarded as superfluities, and to some extent the limitation which Blass[2] finds in the N.T., viz. that one future now suffices for each voice, is found also in the LXX: i.e. *ἕξω* is used to the exclusion of *σχήσω*, *μνησθήσομαι* (not *μεμνήσομαι*), *στήσω* and *στήσομαι* (not *ἑστήξω*): but *φανοῦμαι* (Pent., Prov., Wis.) remains beside *φανήσομαι*, and the fut. perf. is represented in at least one instance (*κεκράξομαι*[3]). The most salient

[1] *Πάντα τὰ ἀρτὰ ὑπ' αὐτῶν* N. iv. 27 (=31 *τῶν αἱρομένων ὑπ' αὐτῶν*) is noticeable. Wisdom has a large number of these adjectives, many of them new.

[2] N.T. § 14, 1.

[3] Cf. *κεκλήσομαι*, § 24.

alteration, however, in the tense system lies in the terminations and in particular in the encroachment of those of the 1st aorist into the sphere of the 2nd aorist. The new termination affected in the first place the 3rd pers. plur. where it took one of two forms: *-ον* became either *-οσαν* or *-αν*. The LXX is perhaps the principal witness to the *-οσαν* forms which are found in abundance throughout the whole collection of books with the exception of a single late group: their rarity in the N.T. suggests that they were an earlier transitional form which made way later for *-αν*. The *-οσαν* forms invaded the imperfect as well as the aorist. The termination *-αν* was eventually extended to all the past tenses: its use for *-ασι* in the perfect no doubt goes back in some instances to the LXX autographs, its employment in the imperfect, though attested, is probably attributable to later copyists. In a few instances an entirely new 1st aor. replaced the old 2nd aor. (*ἤξα* for *ἤγαγον* etc.). In the passive correctly formed but unclassical 1st aorists and kindred futures arose, though in one group of words the contrary phenomenon appears, the substitution of new 2nd aorists passive for 1st aorists, probably out of regard for euphony (§ 21, 4). The periphrastic conjugation widens its range, partly but not entirely owing to the influence of the Hebrew original, the auxiliary verb being now employed with the present participle to represent the imperf., future and more rarely the present tense: periphrasis in the perfect goes back to the earlier language.

The dual has disappeared from the verb as from all parts of speech.

§ 16. Augment and Reduplication.

1. Three main features under this head distinguish the modern from the classical language, viz. (1) the almost complete disappearance in the former of the temporal augment, (2) the consistently external position of the syllabic augment,

and (3) the disappearance of reduplication. The LXX illustrates the movement towards the first of these changes: the second and third had hardly begun in the LXX period, but a few premonitory signs of them appear in some of the uncials.

2. **Loss of syllabic augment.** The syllabic augment ἐ on the whole retained its place in the κοινή as it has also, to a considerable extent, in the modern language. The main exception to this in the κοινή was the **pluperfect**, the only tense which contained both augment and reduplication. The κοινή, as Thumb remarks[1], strove to obliterate the distinction between these two, and ultimately reduplication disappeared from the language: in the pluperf. the presence of both aug. and redupl. was felt to be superfluous, and the augment, as the more easily detachable element, was the one to disappear. The active forms lost the augment sooner than the passive[2]. The internal and therefore less conspicuous augment in compounds was also, it seems, more often dropped than the initial augment in simple verbs. In the LXX MSS omission is frequent in the active, insertion is the rule in the passive[3].

Pluperf. act. The aug. is consistently *retained* in one word, ἐπεποίθειν: Dt. xxxii. 37, Prov. xxi. 22, Job vi. 13, Zeph. iii. 2 BN, Is. xxx. 15, 32 (πεποίθει B), Jer. xxvii. 38, xxxi. 7, xlvi. 18 (πεποίθεις N), Bar. iii. 17, Ez. xvi. 15 (κατεπ.), Sus. 0 35, Dan. Θ iii. 95. Πέποιθα had come to be regarded as a present, and

[1] *Hell.* 170 "Die Κοινή strebte ganz allgemein darnach, die Grenzen zwischen Reduplikation und Augment zu verwischen, d. h. dieses für jene einzusetzen." Wackernagel suggests that the loss of the aug. in the pluperf. may have been due to the influence of the considerable number of verbs in which the *anlaut* of perf. and pluperf. were identical, e.g. εἴληφα εἰλήφειν.

[2] Owing, perhaps, to their rarer and more literary use. Cf. the longer survival of the old forms in the passive of verbs in -μι (§ 23, 1).

[3] In the Ptolemaic papyri the passives always have the augment, the actives more often than not, Mayser 333 f. (320 ff.): in papyri of the Imperial age the examples of omission increase. Polybius drops the augment in compounds, mainly in the active (only one ex. of omission in the *simplex* in Books 1—v, Wackernagel *Indog. Forsch.* v. Anz. 1): Josephus likewise usually omits the aug. in the pluperf. act. and inserts it in the passive, W. Schmidt 438.

produced a new aorist *ἐπεποίθησα*: *ἐπεποίθει* would be regarded as an imperf. like *ἐτίθει*. Otherwise the augmented forms are practically confined to literary books: *ἐγεγόνειν* always, Job iv. 12, x. 19 A, 1 M. iv. 27 ℵV, 2 M. xii. 39, xiii. 17: *ἐδεδοίκειν* Job iii. 25, xxix. 14 ℵ*A (see below), xxxi. 35 (ἠδ. A): *ἐπεπόνθεισαν* W. xviii. 1.

The aug. is *omitted* in *βεβήκει* W. xviii. 16, *ἐπι-βεβ.* N. xxii. 22 BF: *παρεμ-βεβλήκεισαν* Jd. vii. 12 A: *ἐν-δεδύκειν* L. xvi. 23 (*ἐνεδύκει* A), Job xxix. 14 BC (*ἐδεδοίκ(ε)ιν* ℵA), Jdth. ix. 1 ℵ (*ἐδεδ.* B), x. 3 Bℵ, Est. D. 6 Aℵ$^{c.a}$ (*ἐνεδεδ.* ℵ*): *βεβρώκει, πεπώκει* 1 K. xxx. 12: *δεδώκειν*[1] 2 K. xviii. 11, 3 K. x. 13: *πεποιήκεισαν* Bel Θ 13: *ἐπι-πεπτώκει* Est. vii. 8: *τεθνήκει* Jd. xix. 28 A.

Pluperf. pass. The aug. is always *retained* in *ἐγέγραπτο* Dt. ix. 10 (*ἐπέγραπτο* A, with loss of redupl.), 3 K. xx. 9, Ez. ii. 10, 1 M. xv. 15, 3 M. iii. 30: also in *ἐπεπλήρωτο* 2 M. iii. 30 V (*ἐπληρ.* A), vi. 5, ix. 7, cf. vi. 4 *ἐπεπληροῦτο* A (*πεπλήρωτο* V): so *συνεκέχυτο* 2 M. xiv. 28, *ἐμέμνητο* W. xix. 10.

Omission occurs in *ὑπομνημάτιστο* 1 Es. vi. 22 B (*ὑπεμν.* A) and in two instances where the pluperf. has lost its force: *τετέλεστο* 2 Es. vii. 12 B (*-ται* A), *κεκόλλητο* Tob. vi. 18 A (*ἐκολλήθη* Bℵ).

Loss of syllabic augment in other tenses receives slight attestation in LXX: it is confined to words in which the syllable which should contain the augment is unaccented (cf. in mod. Greek *ἔγραψα* but *γράψαμε* etc.).

Perf. *ἀποσπασμένοι* Is. xxviii. 9 Bℵ*. *Aor.* and *impf.*: *οὓς ἐξαποστείλατε* Jer. xli. 16 B*ℵ* (*ἐξαπεστ.* cett.), *μοιχᾶτο* ib. iii. 8 ℵ*, *ἀνακάλυψα* ib. xxix. 11 ℵ*, *ποίησεν* Is. xx. 2 ℵ* (read *ποίησον*), *ἐπιτήδευσεν* Est. E. 12 A, *θαυμάσθησαν* 4 M. xviii. 3 A* (cf. *παροιμίαζεν* ib. 16 ℵ = *ἐπαροιμ.* AV).

3. **Form of syllabic augment: ἠ- for ἐ-.** In the *κοινή* the temporal augment of *ἐθέλω* was retained, although the present was now always written as *θέλω*. So in LXX (as in papyri, N.T. etc.) we invariably find, beside present *θέλω*, the past tenses *ἤθελον, ἠθέλησα*. The *ἠ-*, of which the true origin was no longer apparent, seems to have been taken for an alternative form of syllabic augment and was commonly

[1] So in papyri from ii/B.C.: the dropping of aug. began early in the uncompounded verb.

attached in *κοινή* Greek to three verbs which had meanings akin to those of *θέλω*, viz. *βούλομαι, δύναμαι, μέλλω*[1].

In LXX the aor. *ἐβουλήθην* is retained (except for an occasional v.l.: *ἠβ.* Ex. x. 27 B^a, 1 K. xxiv. 11 B, Ψ xxxix. 9 AB^{ab}, lxxvii. 10 $\aleph^{c.a}$, 1 M. vii. 30 A): the imperfect is in most books *ἐβουλόμην*, but *ἠβουλ.* is strongly supported in Isaiah (i. 29, xxx. 9, 15 B*O, lxv. 12 ℵ, lxvi. 4 ℵQ: against *ἐβ.* xxx. 15 $B^c\aleph AQ$, xlii. 24, lxv. 12 BAQ, lxvi. 4 BA) and in 1 Macc. (iv. 6, v. 48, xi. 45, 49 [*ἐβ.* $\aleph^{c.a}$V], xii. 14 [*ἐβ.* V], xv. 27 [do.]), and occurs as a v.l. in 1 K. viii. 19 B, 1 Ch. xi. 19 ℵ*, Ψ cxiii. 11 ℵ*, Dan. Θ v. 19 *quater* B.

In the case of *δύναμαι* there is much stronger support for the augment *ἠ-*. The aor. always appears as *ἠδυνήθην* (except for two variants with *ἐδ.* in A: Dan. Θ ii. 47, 2 M. ii. 6) or *ἠδυνάσθην* (*ἐδ.* twice only in B, 2 Ch. xx. 37, Jer. v. 4, 6 times in A): in the imperf. there is greater fluctuation, but *ἠδυνάμην* on the whole is preferred.

The imperf. of *μέλλω* is used twice only and the two literary writers appear to have differed as to the correct form: *ἔμελλεν* 4 M. xvii. 1 AℵV, but *ἤμελλεν* W. xviii. 4 BA (*ἔμ.* ℵ).

The analogy of *ἠδυνάμην* further produced *ὑπερηδυνάμωσαν* Ψ lxiv. 4 B*ℵ*T. *Ἡδεδοίκειν* Job xxxi. 35 A shows how this form of augment, which has survived in some modern Greek dialects (*ἤφερα* etc.), spread to other verbs.

4. **Loss of temporal augment.** The syllabic augment which took the invariable form *ἐ-* was always much less liable to omission or alteration than the temporal which affected the different initial vowels of verbs in various ways. The changes in pronunciation which coincided with the spread of the *κοινή*, particularly the loss of distinction between *ε—η* (*ευ—ηυ*), *ο—ω*, and the pronunciation of the diphthongs as monophthongs (*οι = υ*), hastened the extinction of the temporal augment which in modern Greek has all but disappeared (*ἄκουσα* etc.). In the LXX, however, as in the Ptolemaic papyri, the temporal

[1] The augment *ἠ-* with these verbs does not appear in Attic Inscriptions till after 300 B.C. (Meisterhans 169): there is however a certain amount of authority for it in earlier literature (Kühner-Blass I. ii. § 197). The old grammarians differed in their verdicts as to the correct forms. The Ptolemaic papyri have *ἠ-*, Mayser 330.

augment is for the most part regular, except that it is generally dropped in verbs beginning with the diphthong *εὐ*: there is also some, but less, authority for the loss of augment in verbs with *anlaut* *οἰ-*. The omission began, it appears, with these two diphthongs: in the case of verbs with a single initial vowel, omission is rare except in compounds[1].

Verbs beginning with *single vowels* are in the main augmented regularly: *ἀ-* becomes *ἠ-* etc. The following exceptions may be noted.

In *ἀ-*: *ἀλλοτριοῦτο* 1 M. xv. 27 V^{vid}. The equivalence of *ἠ*—*ἐ* appears in the spelling of Cod. A: *ἐλλόμην* Job vi. 10 (for *ἠλλ.*).

In *ἐ-*: *ἐλαττονώθη* (*-ήθη*) 3 K. xvii. 16 BA. *ἐξεγειρόμην* Ψ cxviii. 62 AT, *ἐξεγέρθησαν* Jer. xxviii. 38 Q* (elsewhere always *ἐξηγ.* and *ἠγ.*). *ἀπελευθερώθη* L. xix. 20 F. *ἐπιστ(άμην)* Job xlii. 3 C, Is. xlviii. 8 ℵ, Jer. ii. 8 A (*ἠπ-* has overwhelming authority). *ἐνυπνιάσθην* (*-ασάμην*) is read by B in Jd. vii. 13, by A (with other uncials) in the remaining (8) passages where the past tenses occur: *ἠν.* is however attested in all these passages except Gen. xxxvii. 10. Ἐρημοῦν omits the augment in B in *ἐρημώθη* 1 Es. iv. 45 and elsewhere in about a dozen instances in other MSS, including the compound with *ἐξ-* (*ἠρ-* is usual). Ἐρωτᾶν always has the augment: *ἐπερωτᾶν* omits it in 1 Es. vi. 11 BA, Is. xxx. 2 B*Q, 4 times in A (Jos. ix. 20, 1 K. x. 22, xxviii. 16, 2 K. xi. 7 *ἐπαιρώτ.*) and once in C (Eccl. vii. 11).

In *ἰ-*: for *ἴδον* see 5 below.

In *ὀ-*: B omits the aug. in the following words (mainly compounds): *ὀλιγώθη* Na. i. 4 B*Q: *ἐξολόθρευεν* 1 Ch. xxi. 15 B*, *ἐξολεθρεύθησαν* Ψ lxxxii. 11 B*ℵRT: *ἀνορθώθησαν* Ez. xvi. 7 B*AΓ, *κατορτώθη* (*sic*) 2 Ch. xxix. 35 B*, *κατορθ.* ib. xxxv. 10 B*A, 16 B*: *ὁμοίωσα* Sir. xxvii. 24 B*ℵ, *ὁμοιώθη* Ez. xxxi. 8 BA: *ἐξομολογοῦντο* Tob. xii. 22 B: *παροξύνθη* Hos. viii. 5 B*, Zech. x. 3 B*ℵAQΓ, *παροξύνατε* Bar. iv. 7 BΓ: *παροργισμένην* Sir. iv. 3 BC. Similar instances in the other uncials (ℵ especially), *ὀλιγοψύχησεν ὁμοιώθην ὀργίσθην παρόξυνα* etc., occur mainly in the Prophetical group. Ὄφελον as a particle introducing a wish never has the augment.

Diphthongs. *αἰ-*: the augment is sometimes omitted in *καταισχύνομαι*: *καταισχυνθήσῃ καθὼς καταισχύνθης* Jer. ii. 36 B*ℵA, cf. *καταισχυνθήσεται...ὥσπερ καταισχύνθη* xxxi. 13 BA, similarly in ℵ *κατεσχ(=αισχ)ύνθη(σαν)* ib. vi. 15, x. 14, xxvi. 24, and

[1] As between *ὠι-* (*ᾠ-*) and *ὠ-*, *ἠι-* (*ᾐ-*) and *ἠ-*, the evidence of the uncials for and against the writing of the *ι* adscript has not been tested. We know from the papyri that it was dropped after *ὠ* from ii/B.C. and after *ἠ* as early as iii/B.C.

probably Is. liv. 4. Similarly *ἀνταναιρέθην* Ψ cviii. 23 A (cf. 5 below, at end).

αὐ-: *ηὐλίσθην*, *ηὐξήθην* etc. are regular: Cod. A affords an instance showing equivalence of *ηὐ*—*εὐ*, *εὐλίζετο* Job xxxi. 32 A. The verbs in *αὐ-* derived from compounds generally take no augment: *αὐτάρκησεν* Dt. xxxii. 10 BAF, *αὐτομόλησα* Jos. x. 1 B, 4 B (*ηὐτ.* A *bis*), 1 M. ix. 24 Aℵ (*ηὐτ.* V, and so BA in 2 K. iii. 8, x. 19).

εὐ:—*εὗρον*, *εὕρηκα*, *εὑρέθην* etc. are practically universal as in the papyri, Mayser 336 f.: the older Att. *ηὑ-* is limited in the B text to *ηὕρισκον* Ex. xv. 22 (with A), *ηὑρέθη(σαν)* 4 K. xx. 13 (do.), 2 Ch. xix. 3, Dan. Θ vi. 22 and is quite rare in other MSS, *ηὑρίσκετο* Gen. v. 24 ADE being the only strongly-supported ex. In compounds and words derived from compounds there is fluctuation, but the unaugmented forms *εὐδόκησα*, *εὐλόγησα*, *(κατ)εύθυνα*, *εὐφράνθην*[1] etc. on the whole preponderate, except in *(προσ)εύχεσθαι*, in which *(προσ)ηυξάμην* etc. are usual, *-ευξάμην* appearing sporadically in B (4 K. vi. 17 etc.), rarely in the other uncials.

οι:—the augment stands as a rule, but there are a considerable number of instances of unaugmented *οι* which had now come to be pronounced quite otherwise than *ωι* (in the papyri these begin to appear in ii/B.C., Mayser 337): e.g. *ἐν ᾗ κατοικήσατε* L. xviii. 3 B, *κατοίκισα* xxiii. 43 B, *κατοικήσαμεν* Dt. xxix. 16 B, *οἰκοδόμησ(αν)* N. xxxii. 34 B*, 37 B*, Jos. ix. 3 B, *παροίστρ(η)σεν* Hos. iv. 16 BAQ, and always *οἰκτείρησα* 4 K. xiii. 23 BA, Ψ lix. 3, cii. 13. The insertion of the aug. in these words tended to obscure the etymology (*οἶκος* etc.).

5. **Form of 'temporal' augment: ει- or η-.** The Attic augment *εἰ* in certain words beginning with a vowel (due to an original *ϝ*, *σ* etc. in the *anlaut*: the augment is therefore strictly syllabic, *ἐϝε* = *ἐε* = *εἰ*) is for the most part retained in LXX as in the *κοινή* generally, but in a few verbs begins to be replaced by *ἠ-*.

Ἐάω has (Att.) impf. *εἴων* (3rd plur. Jos. xix. 48 a, 2 M. xii. 2: but with loss of aug. and termin. *-σαν ἐῶσαν*[2] Jer. xli. 10 BA [*ἔασαν* Q*, *ἔσωσαν* ℵ]), aor. *εἴασα* (1 M. xv. 14, 2 M. x. 20, Job xxxi. 34 [*ἴασα* A, *ἆσα* C]), aor. pass. *ἰάθησαν* (=*εἰαθ.*) 3 M. v. 18 V (*ἰάσθ.* A). *Εἰθισμένην* 2 M. xiv. 30 V is the usual form (*ἠθ.* A):

[1] The LXX Psalter was at an early time written in two volumes: the scribe of Part I wrote *ηὐφρ.*, the scribe of Part II *εὐφρ.*: cf. p. 68.

[2] Not from *ὠθεῖν* under which verb (as well as under *ἐᾶν*) it appears in Hatch-Redpath. With the phrase in Jer. *ἐῶσαν αὐτοὺς εἰς παῖδας* cf. Aristeas § 14 *εἴασεν εἰς τὴν οἰκετείαν*.

εἴωθα N. xxiv. 1 (ἰωθός B*F) etc. Ἕλκω (ἐξ- ἐφ-) has (Att.) εἵλκον -όμην, εἵλκυσα -ύσθην with v.l. ἥλκυσας 2 Es. xix. 30 A, ἥλκυσα Ψ cxviii. 131 ℵ*A. Ἐξῆρψεν Ψ civ. 30 (the only LXX ex. of past tense from ἕρπω) replaces Attic (ἐξ)είρπυσα. The distinction, generally observed in Attic Inscriptions, between augment (ἡ-) and reduplication (εἰ-) in the past tenses of ἐργάζομαι is also the rule in LXX, the imperf. appearing only as ἠργαζόμην Ex. xxxvi. 4, W. xiv. 8 (εἰργ. in correctors of B), and the perf. as εἴργασμαι: in the aorist the books diverge, ἠργασάμην being certainly the right reading in Job (xxiv. 6 B*ℵ, xxxiv. 32 B*ℵ*A) and perhaps in Hos. vii. 1 B* (εἰργ. B^{ab}AQ), whereas εἰργασάμην is used in Isaiah (xliv. 12 *bis*, 15) and Psalms (vii. 14 ἐξ-, 16, xxx. 20 ἐξ-, xliii. 2, lxxiii. 12). (Εἶχον, ἔσχον as usual.) The aug. is dropped under the influence of the moods (as in N.T.) in ἀνέθη Jd. viii. 3 B, ἀφέθησαν Ψ xxxi. 1 BAR (-εἰθ. ℵ), but retained in παρείθησαν 2 K. iv. 1 BA (no perf. act. attested: perf. pass. ἀν-παρ-εῖμαι regular). Ἴδον[1] (Epic for εἶδον=ἜFιδον) is very frequent in A and ℵ: B usually writes εἶδον but in the Pentateuch also ἴδον e.g. ἔπιδεν Ex. ii. 25, ἴδεν iii. 4 BA, 7 ἰδὼν ἴδον BA, etc. The LXX pluperf. of ἕστηκα usually appears as ἱστήκειν, which is no doubt nothing but another way of spelling the classical εἱστήκειν (the latter is usual in B in 1—4 Kingdoms and appears occasionally elsewhere: the correctors of the uncials usually restore it for ἱστ.): ἑστήκειν (without aug.: Epic) occurs as a variant in Zech. i. 8 ℵ*, 1 M. xi. 38 Aℵ ἀνθ-, 3 M. iii. 5 V* κατ-, 4 M. xvi. 15 A.

There is overwhelming authority in the Ptolemaic papyri for the writing of εἰ- for ἡ- in the perf. act. and pass. of one verb not coming under the foregoing category, viz. αἱρέω. These tenses constantly appear as -εἵρηκα -εἵρημαι, so that, except by the context, they are indistinguishable from the perfect of ἐρῶ[2]. On the other hand ἡ- (ἠι-) is retained in the imperf.[3] This may, as Mayser holds, be a mere case of itacism (cf. for further instances § 6, 20), but the constancy of these forms in the case of this verb and the distinction between the perf. and the imperf. suggest that it is something more than an orthographical

[1] Analogy may have played a part in the κοινή use of this form: as εἰπεῖν was inf. of εἶπον, so, perhaps it was thought, ἰδεῖν must be inf. of ἴδον. The Ptolemaic papyri have εἶδον throughout, Mayser 332 note 2.

[2] Mayser 127, 335: he quotes 19 exx. of -ει-, beginning in iii/B.C., one only of ἠρηκέναι. The latest exx. which I have noted are ὑφειρημένων (*sic*) OP ii. 282. 22 (30—35 A.D.), συνδιειρημένων BU 1037. 10 (47 A.D.).

[3] Mayser 123.

matter: the analogy of εἴργασμαι ἠργαζόμην may very well have produced εἴρημαι beside ἠρούμην. The same forms of the perfect (pluperf.) appear sporadically in LXX in B and ℵ and, in view of the evidence from the papyri, can lay good claim to originality: ἀφείρηται Ex. xxix. 27 B, καθείρητο Jd. vi. 28 B, καθειρημένα 2 Es. xi. 3 Bℵ, ἀφείρητο Jdth xiv. 15 ℵ, ἀνειρημένοις Jer. iv. 31 B, καθειρημένων ib. xl. 4 ℵ, καθειρημένα 1 M. iv. 38 ℵ.

The classical forms are however more frequent in the uncials (e.g. 1 K. v. 4, xxi. 6, xxiv. 12, Is. ix. 4, xvi. 2) and are always written in A. The impf. is regular, ἤρουν, ἠρούμην 1 K. xix. 2 etc.: the aor. pass. is -ηρέθην with v.ll. ἀνερέθη Dan. Θ v. 30 B, ἀφερέθη 1 M. ii. 11 V and with loss of aug. ἀνταναιρέθην Ψ cviii. 23 A.

Ἠρήνευσα Job iii. 26 A (εἰρ. cett.) is merely itacistic: cf. the reading of the same MS ἀφείλαντο in Ez. xliv. 10 for ἀφήλαντο of BQ (=the Heb. "went far").

6. **Double augment (temporal + syllabic).** A certain number of verbs beginning with a vowel took in the older language a syllabic augment (accounted for by an original ϝ) in addition to (or in place of) a temporal[1]. In the κοινή these old anomalous forms had ceased to be intelligible and begin to make way for others without the syllabic augment: the latter, where retained, sometimes intrudes into the moods and the future. Four verbs in the LXX fall under this category[2].

(Κατ)άγνυμι keeps the Attic aor. act. κατέαξα Zech. i. 21 (part. κατάξας 2 K. xxii. 35): the corresponding 1st aor. pass. κατεάχθην Jer. xxxi. 25 replaces Att. 2nd aor. κατεᾴγην: the fut. κατάξω Hb. iii. 12 (and as v.l. elsewhere) is regular (no ex. of κατεάξω as in N.T.).

Ἀνοίγω (original verb ὀϝείγω, then ϝοίγω, K.-Bl. *loc. cit.*) (1) rarely retains the Attic aorist ἀνέῳξα -ῴχθην, but usually still keeps the perf. part. pass. ἀνεῳγμένος, (2) sometimes

[1] Kühner-Blass 1. ii. § 198, 5. The temporal augment is explained as simply due to the two short syllables εο, εα appearing to the ear as lacking something of the sound of an augment: "man εο, εᾰ nicht als augmentiert empfand."

[2] No ex. of a past tense from ὠνέομαι occurs in LXX. Ἐᾶλων, ἐᾱλωκα as in Attic (Is. and Jer. α).

supplements the double classical augment by yet a third (external) augment, but (3) normally employs for aorist the new forms *ἤνοιξα ἠνοίχθην.*

	Class. double augment.	New treble augment.	New single augment.
Aorist	*ἀνέῳξα* Gen. viii. 6 DE, xxi. 19 AD, xxx. 22 A, xli. 56: 2 Ch. xxix. 3: Ψ lxxvii. 23 B^{ab}ℵRT (So *προσέῳξα* Gen. xix. 6)	*ἠνέῳξα* Gen. viii. 6 A, xxx. 22 DE: Ψ lxxvii. 23 B*: 3 M. vi. 18	*ἤνοιξα passim* (including Gen. xxix. 31, xliii. 21, xliv. 11)
	ἀνεῴχθην Is. xxiv. 18 B	*ἠνεῴχθην* Gen. vii. 11: Sir. xliii. 14: Is. xxiv. 18 ℵAQΓ: Dan. ΟΘ vii. 10	*ἠνοίχθην passim*
Perf. act.	*ἀνέῳγα* Tob. ii. 10 B (in late passive sense)		
Perf. pass.	*ἀνεῳγμένος* N. xix. 15: Jos. viii. 17: 3 K. viii. 29 A: 2 Ch. vi. 20, 40, vii. 15: 2 Es. xi. 6 BA, xvi. 5: Ψ v. 10, xiii. 3: Ez. xxix. 21: Dan. Θ vi. 10 B	*ἠνεῳγμένος* 3 K. viii. 29 B, viii. 52: 2 Es. xi. 6 ℵ: Is. xlii. 20 Γ: Dan. Θ vi. 10 A	*ἠνοιγμένος* Is. xlii. 20 BℵAQ
Pluperf. pass.	*ἀνέῳκτο* Job xxxi. 32 B	*(δι)ηνέῳκτο* ib. ℵAC	

The imperfect is only found in the later form *ἤνοιγον -όμην* 3 K. vii. 21, 1 M. xi. 2 (not Attic *ἀνέῳγον*).

Ὁράω keeps the Attic imperf. *ἑώρων* (*ἑόρα* 4 M. iv. 24 A: the literary essayist no doubt wrote *ἑώρα* ℵV), but in the imperf. mid. loses both *ε* and *ω* in the compound *προορώμην* Ψ xv. 8 (*προωρ.* B^{ab}). *Ἑώρακα* (which appears to be the older Attic form)[1] is universal in the Pentateuch (excepting *ἑόρ.* Dt. xxxiii. 9 B*F), is used in literary books (Dan. O, 1 Es., Est., 2 M.: once in each) and has preponderant authority in Jeremiah—Baruch: in the majority of the books, however, *ἑόρακα* is strongly supported. The perf. pass. *ἑώραμαι* (rare in class. Greek) is so written in L. xiv. 35 (*ἑόρ.* F) and in the participles *παρεωραμένος* 3 K. x. 3, Eccl. xii. 14, *ὑπερεωρ.* Na. iii. 11: the late B text of Judges (xix. 30) has *ἑόραται.* The syllabic augment is dropped in the 1st aor. pass. *ὡράθησαν* Dan. Θ i. 15: otherwise this tense, which is not used before Aristotle, occurs only in the moods.

Ὠθέω. The LXX translators, in common with other Hellenistic writers, dropped the Attic syllabic augment (*ἔωσα, ἐώσθην, ἐωσάμην, ἔωσμαι*), and wrote *ὦσα* (*ἀπ- ἐξ-*) Job xiv. 20 etc., (*ἀπ- ἐξ*)*ώσθην, ἀπωσάμην,* (*ἀπ- ἐξ-*)*ὦσμαι.* The only book which consistently has *ἐ-* is 4 Kingdoms, where its use is a clear case of unintelligent Atticism, because the translator (or scribe), not content with *ἐξέωσεν* xvii. 21 and *ἀπεώσαντο* xvii. 20, has introduced the augment into the inf. *ἀπεώσασθαι* iv. 27 B and the fut. *ἀπεώσομαι* xxi. 14 BA, xxiii. 27 B (cf. 9 *inf.*)[2].

For the late double augment in compound verbs see 8 below.

7. **Reduplication. Peculiar forms.** Initial *ρ* is reduplicated contrary to Attic rule (Ionic has similar forms) in *ῥέριμμαι* Jd. iv. 22 B, xv. 15 B (*ἐκ-*), Tob. i. 17 B, Jdth vi. 13 A,

[1] See Veitch s. v. for the claims of *ἑώρακα—ἑόρακα.* The latter is certain in old Comedy and may have always been the vernacular form.

[2] The aug. appears also in *ἐξεωσμένον* 2 K. xiv. 14 B (this portion of 2 K. was the work of the translator of 4 K., § 2) beside *ἐξωσμ.* in the preceding and *ἐξῶσαι* in the same verse. *Ἀπεωσθῆναι* Lam. iii. 45 A is a further ex. of augmented inf.

Jer. xliii. 30 A: elsewhere class. ἔρριμμαι (or ἔριμμαι, § 7, 39)[1]. The list of so-called 'Attic' reduplicated forms is enriched in the *κοινή* by the addition of ἀγήγοχα (for Att. ἦχα), also, through non-pronunciation of intervocalic γ, written ἀγήοχα ἀγείοχα ἀγέοχα[2]: this is the perf. used in LXX, spelt ἀγίοχα in the uncials (later hands correct to ἀγήοχα), Gen. xlvi. 32, L. x. 19 B*F (-αγειόχ. A), 1 K. xxi. 15 -αγειόχ. B* (-αγιάχ. A), Tob. xii. 3 B*ℵA, Sir. xxv. 3 B* (-αγείοχ. ℵA), 3 M. v. 19 AV*, 45 AV*: perf. pass. ἦγμαι class. Dt. xxxii. 34 etc. Ὁμώμοκα (Ψ cxviii. 106 ℵ) is becoming obsolete and appears in various degenerate forms: ὀμωμέκαμεν 1 K. xx. 42 B* (ὠμωμόκ. A), ὀμώμεχα Ez. vi. 9 A, ὀμώμοχεν Tob. ix. 3 BA. Μεμνήστευμαι appears thus with reduplication (on the model of μέμνημαι) Dt. xx. 7, xxii. 23 ff., A once (xxii. 23) writing the more regular ἐμνηστευμένη used by St Luke (no class. instance of the perf.). Βεβλάστηκα (Joel ii. 22) and κέκτημαι are written, not the alternative class. forms without initial consonant. Θέλω has now perf. τεθέληκα Ψ xl. 12 (class. ἐθέλω ἠθέληκα).

Loss of reduplication or substitution of augment. Reduplication, which has disappeared from the modern language, begins to show signs of decay in the *κοινή*, being either replaced by the augment (on the model set by earlier Greek in the case of initial ῥ or a double letter etc.) or suppressed altogether (cf. the pres. μνήσκομαι § 19, 3). The few LXX examples are practically limited to Codex A and doubtless do not go back to the autographs.

Augment *vice* reduplication: ἐνεδύκει L. xvi. 23 A (ἐνδεδύκει B -δεδοίκει F), ἥλιφα[3] N. iii. 12 A with ἠλιμμένοι ib. 3 BA (F

[1] Other words with initial ῥ take ἐρρ. as in Attic: διέρραγκα (-ανκα B*, -ακα ℵ) Prov. vii. 17 may be mentioned as being apparently the earliest instance of a perf. from ῥαίνω: the earlier language avoided these perfects in -γκα.

[2] Mayser 338.

[3] Εἵληφα of BF (M.T. לקחתי) is obviously right. The reading of A is a rather clever conjectural emendation, characteristic of this MS, made by a slight transposition of letters, under the influence of οἱ ἠλιμμένοι *v.* 3, with-

ἠλειμμ.) (class. ἀλήλιφα, ἀλήλιμμαι), ἐπέγραπτο Dt. ix. 10 A, κατέβηκεν 3 K. xx. 18 A, ἀπώλεκας Is. xlix. 20 A, ἐλάληκα Ez. iii. 10 A, Jer. xxviii. 41 ℵ*, ἐνεπυρισμένον 1 M. xi. 4 A (ib. ἐνπεπ. AℵV), ἐπλήρωτο 2 M. iii. 30 A[1]. Suppression of reduplication[2] (as in mod. Greek pass. part. e.g. δεμένος): λογισμένον 3 K. x. 21 A.

Other anomalies of A are μαμακρυνκότων Jd. xviii. 22 (for μεμ.), φεφύλαξαι 1 K. xxii. 23 (πεφ. B). Μεμαρτύρω 2 Es. xix. 34 B* is a strange reduplicated aorist (διεμαρτύρω cett.).

8. **Augment and reduplication in composition.** In verbs which are *true compounds* of the *simplex* and a preposition, the augment and reduplication still, as in Attic, occupy the internal position after the preposition (ἀπ-ήντησα, προ-ε-πορευόμην[3] etc.), except—an exception which applies also to Attic—where the simple verb had become obsolete or from the frequent use of the compound the fact of its composition had ceased to be felt, e.g. ἐκάθευδον, ἐκάθισα. There are as yet scarcely any indications of a movement in the direction of giving every augment an external position and, so to speak, stamping upon the forefront the fact that the tense is a past one, as in modern Greek (ἐκατάλαβα, ἐπρόσεξα). Ἤνοιξα already referred to (6 *sup.*) is new, but lacks contemporary support from the papyri.

In verbs *derived from compounds* (παρασύνθετα, *decomposita*) of a preposition the latter was strictly inseparable from the remaining constituent, which did not generally exist as a simple verb, and an external augment was therefore required. Nevertheless, many, indeed the majority of these verbs, were, apparently through mistaken etymology, treated as though

out regard to the Hebrew. A similar instance in this MS of emendation of the Greek occurs close by in *v.* 9, μόνοι for μοί (=לִי, M.T. לוֹ).

[1] Is ΚΕΚΛΗΚΕΝ 4 K. iii. 10 A intended for a correction to ἔκληκεν?

[2] Examples from the papyri, mainly in compounds, are given by Mayser 341.

[3] The only LXX instance of crasis with προ- is προυφάνησαν 4 M. iv. 10 Aℵ (προεφ. V), see § 9, 11 for crasis in this book: elsewhere προέβαλλον, προεμάχησα etc.

they were true compounds and augmented internally[1]. The *κοινή*, as illustrated by the LXX, adhered to Attic precedent and the following e.g. have classical support:

Ἀπεδήμησα (from *ἀπόδημος*) Ez. xix. 3 A, *ἀπελογησάμην* 2 M. xiii. 26, *ἐνήδρευσα*, *ἐνεθυμήθην* (*ἐντεθυμημένης* 3 M. i. 25), *ἐνεχείρησα*, *ἐπεθύμησα*, *ἐπεστάτουν* 1 Es. vii. 2, *ἐπετήδευσα*, *ἐπεχείρησα*, *κατηγόρησα* (without syll. aug.), *παρενόμουν* Ψ cxviii. 51 A (*παρηνόμουν* RT as from *παρ-ανομεῖν*), *προεθυμήθην*, *ὑπώπτευσα*.

Ἐνεγυήσω Prov. vi. 3 (2 sg. aor. mid. from *ἐγγυάω*) may be illustrated from the papyri, where the augment takes various forms[2]. Other verbs beginning with *ἐν-* have fluctuating augment as

ἠνεχύρασα (*-αζον*) Job xxii. 6, xxiv. 3	*ἐνεχύρασα* Job xxxiv. 31 A, Ez. xviii. 16
ἠνυπνιάσθην (*-ασάμην*)	*ἐνυπνιάσθην* (*-ασάμην*) : 4 *sup.*
ἠνωτισάμην 2 Es. xix. 30 B	*ἐνωτισάμην* ib. ℵA, Job xxxii. 11 A, Jer. xxiii. 18.

Ἐξεκλησίασα (as if there were a simple verb *κλησιάζω*) is read by B in 1 Ch. xv. 3, 2 Ch. v. 2 etc. and by A, ℵ, V elsewhere, and in view of the fact that in the unaugmented parts of the verb (imperat. and part.) we find no trace in LXX of a verb *ἐξ-εκκλησιάζω* with superfluous preposition, it is probable that *ἐξεκκλησίασα -άσθην* which the uncials read in L. viii. 4 etc. are scribal corruptions of *ἐξεκλησίασα -άσθην*.

On the other hand with initial augment we have consistently *ἐπρονόμευσα* (*κατεπρο-*: correctly as the verb is formed from *προνομή*, not directly from *νομεύω*) and *πεπρονομευμένος* Is. xlii. 22 (AF alone have *προενόμευσα* twice, N. xxxi. 9, Dt. ii. 35: so ℵ$^{c.a}$ in 1 M. i. 61)—*ἐπροφήτευσα* (B *προεφήτευσα* only in Sir. xlvi. 20: A 4 times in 1 K.[3], cf. *προπεφητεῦσθαι* in the citation from Origen in Q^{mg} Ez. xxxii. 17)—*ἐπαροιμίαζεν* 4 M. xviii. 16 (*παροιμ.* ℵ)—*ἐπερίσσευσα* (class.). New verbs also tend to external augment: *ἠσυνθέτησα* (*-κα*) 2 Es. x. 2, 10 etc., *ἠκαταστάτησαν* Tob. i. 15 B.

[1] See the list in Kühner-Blass I. ii. § 204 and Rutherford *NP* p. 79 ff.
[2] Mayser 343. [3] Also *προεφήτευον* 3 K. xxii. 12 A.

Verbs derived from compounds in which the first element is not a preposition usually in classical Greek take external augment[1]: so in LXX e.g. ᾠκοδόμησα (or οἰκ., 4 *sup.*), ἐπαρρησιάσατο Ψ xciii. 1 etc.: ἐδυστόκησα, ἐδυσφήμησα, ἐδυσφόρουν are classical, but εὐ- followed by a short vowel has internal aug., εὐηρέστησα always and εὐηγγελισάμην in the only occurrence of the past tense, Ψ xxxix. 10: between ηὐ- and εὐ- in other *decomposita* (εὐφραίνειν etc.) there is fluctuation as in the direct compounds of εὖ.

Verbs compounded of two prepositions tend to take **two augments** (cf. 6 *sup.*). The older language supplied a few standing examples of this e.g. (παρ)ηνώχλησα (always so written in LXX except in Jd. xiv. 17 B* παρενώχ.) and ἐπηνώρθουν (LXX has only ἐπανωρθώθη 2 M. v. 20 A, ἐπανορθ. V*), in addition to ἠνειχόμην (so 3 M. i. 22 A), ἠνεσχόμην (but LXX ἀνεσχόμην [class. poetry] Is. lxiii. 15, lxiv. 12, 4 M. xiii. 27). The LXX has not carried much further this practice, which became common at a rather later date, and, as it is unrepresented in the Ptolemaic papyri[2], the originality of the commonest LXX instance ἀπεκατέστη(σεν) is open to question.

Further instances are παρεκατέθε(ν)το (-ετιθέμην) Jer. xlvii. 7, xlviii. 10, 2 M. ix. 25 A: παρεσυνεβλήθη Ψ xlviii. 13 AT$\aleph^{c.a}$, 21 AT: ἐνεπεριεπατήσαμεν Jd. xviii. 9 A: κατεδιείλαντο Jl. iii. 2 $\aleph^{c.a}$ (καταδιείλ. cett.).

Reduplication+augment occurs in κεκατήραμαι[3] N. xxii. 6 (καικατ. or καὶ κατ. F), xxiv. 9 (do. A), Dt. xxi. 23 AF (κεκαταρα-

[1] With internal reduplication ἐμπεποδεστάτηκας read by a group of MSS in Jd. xi. 35 (cf. the corruption of it in A) is a curious instance.

[2] Mayser 342. In LXX ἀπεκατέστη(σεν) appears in Gen. xxiii. 16, xl. 21, Ex. iv. 7 B*A, xiv. 27, Jer. xxiii. 8 (Hexaplaric), 1 Es. i. 33 B, Bel Θ 39: on the other hand with single aug. ἀποκατεστάθη Dan. O iv. 33, 34b, ἀντικατέστη(σεν) Jos. v. 7, Mic. ii. 8 A, ἐπισυνέστη(σεν) N. xvi. 19, Sir. xlv. 18, προσκατέστησαν Jd. xiv. 11 A. Similarly with single aug. προκατελάβετο *passim*, etc.

[3] Cf. the external aug. in ἐκαταρασάμην 2 Es. xxiii. 25 B and double aug. ἐπεκατηράσατο Ψ cli. 6 T: the aor. in LXX is elsewhere the class. κατηρασάμην. A curious instance illustrating the insufficiency in v/A.D. of internal reduplication is ἐπροσκέκληται Ex. v. 3 F.

μένος B), Sir. iii. 16 (κακατ. ℵC): the class. κατήραμαι remains in 4 K. ix. 34, W. xii. 11 (κακατ. ℵ). Exx. of double aug. in compounds of one preposition only—a half-way house towards the modern Greek elimination of the internal aug.—appear in late books or late texts only: ἐπροσηύξατο 2 Es. x. 1 B*ℵA (but προσηυξάμην [-ευξ.] xii. 4 and elsewhere in LXX), ἐδιελύσαμεν 2 Es. xi. 7 ℵ*, ἐδιέκρινεν Job xxiii. 10 ℵ*, ἐπαρεκάλουν Job xxix. 25 C, ἐκατέλαβεν 1 M. xii. 30 A, ἐσυνέθετο 1 M. xv. 27 AV.

9. **Misplaced augment.** The augment in vulgar Greek occasionally intruded into the moods[1]. The LXX examples are limited to εἰ for ἰ (which had now become interchangeable sounds) and ὠ for ὀ or οἰ. Ἵνα μὴ εἴδῃ (for ἴδῃ) Is. xxvi. 10 B*ℵQΓ, εἰδέτωσαν 4 K. vi. 20 A, Tob. viii. 12 B*A, εἴδετε (imperat.) 4 K. vi. 32 A, εἴδωμεν Cant. vii. 12 ℵ, (ὑπερ)είδης Eccl. v. 7 A, Est. C. 9 A, εἰδόντες Est. viii. 15 ℵ. Ὠκοδομήσαντες Jos. xxii. 16 A, (δι)ωκοδομήσωμεν 2 Es. xii. 17 B*, Is. ix. 10 A, ὠκοδομουμένη Ψ cxxi. 3 T: ἐξωμολογεῖσθαι Tob. xiii. 3 A (=imperat. ἐξομολογεῖσθε): ὠμόσαντες W. xiv. 29 C.

§ 17. Verbs in -Ω. Terminations.

1. The most marked change under this head is the gradual **disappearance of the second aorist forms** and the **intrusion of the first aorist** forms into their place and subsequently into the place of the other past tenses (perfect and imperfect)[2]. This extension of the sphere of the first aorist takes place in various ways. Primarily it affected the *terminations* only, beginning probably with the termination of the 3rd person plural: and here again there was divergence. (i) The α of the 1st aor. replaces the ο (or ε) in the termination of the 2nd aor.: εἶπα -αν -άτω, ἤγαγα. The termination -αν is then extended to the 3rd plur. of perfect and imperfect. (ii) An alternative was to retain the σ of the 1st aorist as well as the α in the 3rd plur. of 2nd aor. and impf.: εἶποσαν,

[1] So in the papyri from iii/B.C.: ἀνηλίσκειν with ἀνήλωμα etc. is the commonest instance: Mayser 345 f. Modern Greek has created a new class of verbs in ξ- containing the old syllabic aug., e.g. ξεβράζω from ἐξ-έβρασα. Cf. 6 *supra*, s. v. ὠθέω.

[2] See especially the important article by K. Buresch in *Rhein. Mus. für Philologie*, Bd. 46, 1891, entitled "Γέγοναν und anderes Vulgärgriechisch," and Dieterich *Untersuch.* 234 ff.

ἠγάγοσαν, ἐφέροσαν. This form seems to have been designed to discriminate between the 1st sing. and the 3rd plur. which in classical Greek ended alike in *-ον* in these two tenses[1]. More rarely (iii) a new 1st aorist replaced the old 2nd aorist: ἦξα (ἠγάγησα), § 21, 1. The result was much simplification and greater uniformity. The otiose 2nd aorist, which conveyed precisely the same meaning as the 1st aorist, disappeared, and all past tenses tended to be formed after the same pattern.

2. The beginnings of the first change referred to above—the use of **forms intermediate between 1st and 2nd aor.** without the σ of the former—go back in two instances to Attic Greek: ἤνεγκα (beside ἤνεγκον), εἶπα (beside εἶπον)[2]. The κοινή naturally took over the α forms in these words.

In LXX **ἤνεγκα** has the *α* forms throughout the indicative and participle (except in 2 M. iii. 35 ἀνενεγκών A [*-ας* V], vi. 21 ἐνεγκόντα A [*-αντα* V]) and usually in the imperative (exceptions ἀνενεγκέτω 2 K. xxiv. 22 B*, ἐνέγκετε 2 Es. xviii. 15 B*: B also has exx. of 2nd sing. *-ένεγκε*, which however may be merely an itacistic spelling of the mid. *-ένεγκαι* which is often attested by the other MSS, so L. ix. 2 BA [read *-και* F], N. xvi. 46 [*-και* AF], Jd. vi. 30, xix. 22, 2 K. xiii. 10, Dan. Οθ Bel 34 [read *-και* as in Θ 33]). The old inf. ἐνεγκεῖν maintained its hold longest, beside ἐνέγκαι[3] which gradually gains ground and in some of the later books nearly succeeds in ousting the former (e.g. ἐνέγκαι in 2 Es. iii. 7, viii. 17, xviii. 1, xx. 34 etc., ἐνεγκεῖν in this book only in viii. 30). The aor. mid. likewise keeps the *α* forms: but ἀπενέγκοιτο receives some support in Job iii. 6.

Similarly **εἶπα** *-ας -αμεν -ατε -αν*, imperat. εἴπατε etc., part. εἴπας are used almost to the exclusion of the *ο* forms: the inf. is generally εἰπεῖν (εἴπαι B* in Ez. xxxiii. 8, 13, 14, *-εῖν* B^{ab}AQ *ter*)[4].

It appears from the papyri that the extension of this type

[1] Herodian (ed. Lentz ii. 237) refers to the Boeotian use of this form with certain verbs, and explains it as due to a desire to equate the number of syllables in the plural persons (εἴδομεν, therefore εἴδοσαν).

[2] Attic Inscriptions have ἤνεγκαν, part. ἐνέγκας, from iv/B.C. (but ἐνεγκεῖν, *-έτω*): εἰπάτω (and εἰπέτω) from 350 B.C., εἴπας from 300 B.C. (but εἰπεῖν): Meisterhans 183 f.

[3] The two forms are used interchangeably in the papyri into i/B.C., Mayser 363.

[4] Ἀνεῖπαι appears already in a papyrus of iii/B.C., Mayser 331.

of aorists to other verbs did not become common till i/A.D. Most second aorists remained unaltered except that, as the LXX shows, in the 3rd plur. the forms in *-οσαν* were frequently employed in place of *-ον*. The MSS of the LXX and the N.T. appear to reflect this difference between the Ptolemaic period and the beginning of the Christian era. In LXX the asigmatic aorists in *-α*, 3rd plur. *-αν*, apart from a few words, are in the main restricted to a single group of books, while the majority of the books have 1st sing. *-ον*, 3rd plur. *-οσαν* (or *-ον*). In the N.T., on the other hand, 3rd plur. *-οσαν* is rare and forms in *-α -αν* are on the increase.

The commonest LXX exx. of the *-α* type after the two which have classical authority are:

εἶλα (*εἰλάμην*) e.g. act. *καθεῖλαν* Gen. xliv. 11, 3 K. xix. 14 etc., *ἀφεῖλαν* 1 M. vii. 47 A, *ἀφεῖλας* Job xxxviii. 15 (*-ες* C): mid. (*ἀν-ἀφ-ἐξ-*)*είλατο* Gen. xxxvii. 21, Ex. ii. 5, xviii. 4, Is. xxxviii. 14 etc.

ἦλθα mainly in imperat. *ἐλθάτω -ατε*. The *ο* forms are, however, normal in the ind. (with 3rd plur. *ἦλθοσαν*), though *α* forms are attested, even in the Pentateuch, e.g. *ἤλθαμεν* N. xiii. 28 B, Dt. xxix. 16 B, *ἤλθατε* Gen. xxvi. 27 etc., *ἦλθαν* Gen. xlvii. 18 B.

ἔπεσα is much commoner than *ἔπεσον*, clearly owing to the fact that the old 2nd aorist already contained the *σ* distinctive of the 1st aorist. The conversion from strong to weak aorist took place without the intervention of a middle stage (as was necessary e.g. in *εὗρον—εὗρα—εὕρησα*). Later scribes may of course be responsible for the LXX forms: Ex. xxxii. 28, L. ix. 24, N. xvi. 22 *et passim.*

Apart from the 5 exx. quoted, instances of this type are rare and confined to late texts and can in few cases be ascribed to the autographs. They are a distinguishing feature of the group Jd. (B text)—4 Kings. **ἔβαλαν** (*ἐξ-*): 3 K. vi. 3, 2 Ch. xxix. 16 A (*-ον* B). **εἶδαν** (*ἴδαν*) Jd. vi. 28 B, xvi. 24 B, xviii. 7 B, 4 K. ii. 15 A, vi. 20 A, Ψ xxxiv. 21 B (contrast *εἶδες* 22), Jdth vi. 12 B𝔖A, 1 M. iii. 17 A, iv. 12 A. **εὗρα**: *εὕραμεν* Gen. xliv. 8 A, xlvii. 25 A, 2 Es. iv. 19 BA, Ψ cxxxi. 6 AT: *εὗρας* 2 Es. xix. 8 𝔖 (*-ες* BA): (*ἀν*)*ευράμενοι* 4 M. iii. 13 f. A, A𝔖. **ἀπέθαναν** R. i. 5 A, 2 K. xi. 17 B, 24 B, xiii. 33 B, 4 K. xi. 1 A, Tob. iii. 9 B*A. **ἔλαβαν** Jd. i. 24 A, 2 K. xxiii. 16 B. **ἐγκατέλιπαν** 4 K. vii. 7 B, 2 Ch. xxix. 6 B: *ἐγκατελίπατε* Is. i. 4 B (*-ελείπατε* Γ *-ελείπετε* AQ). **ἐφάγαμεν** 2 K. xix. 42 B. **ἔφυγαν** Jd. vii. 21 B, 1 K. xvii. 51 A, xxx. 17 A, 2 K. x. 13 B, 14 BA, xiii. 29 B, 1 M. x. 82 A (contrast 83, xvi. 8, 10): *κατέφυγα* Ψ cxlii. 9 RT𝔖$^{c.a}$ (*-ον* B*𝔖*A).

ἐπήγαγας Dan. Θ iii. 28 Q. **γενάμενος** (common in the papyri from 100 A.D.) is written by A in Jeremiah (xiv. 1, xxv. 1, xxxvii. 1, xxxix. 1, xli. 1, 8=*γενέμενος* ℵ, xlii. 1, li. 1): so *ἐγενάμην* Jer. ii. 31 A, *ἐγενάμεθα* Is. lxiii. 19 ℵ, *παραγενάμενοι* 2 M. xv. 24 V.

3. The first aorist termination **-αν** begins to replace **-ασι** in the **perfect** in (iii/) ii/B.C.[1], although **-ασι** preponderates for some time longer and seems to have survived till the tense became extinct.

Exx. in LXX :—*ἑώρακαν* Dt. xi. 7 B (*ἑώρων* AF), *ἔγνωκαν* 2 K. xix. 6 A (*ἔγνωκα* B), *παρέστηκαν* Is. v. 29 Bℵ*Q, *ἑάλωκαν* Jer. xxviii. 56 ℵ*, *πεποίηκαν* Ez. viii. 15 A (passage not in B), *πεφύτευκαν* xix. 13 BQ, *ἠχρείωκαν* Dan. O vi. 20, *πέποιθαν* Jdth vii. 10 BℵA, *πέπρακαν* 2 M. x. 21 AV, *καθέστηκαν* 2 M. xiv. 5 V, *ἐκπεπόρθηκαν* 4 M. xviii. 4 ℵ*V (*ἐκπεπολιόρκηκαν* ℵ[c.a]).

4. The extension of 3rd plur. **-αν** to the **imperfect** is also attested in ii/B.C., but is much rarer than its use with the other past tenses: the alternative termination *-οσαν* was preferred with this tense. The LXX instances are confined in the B text to one in Jd. and three in the early chapters of 2 K. (K. *ββ*) besides a few variants in Aℵ.

Κατέλειπαν Jo. x. 40 A, *ἀνέβαιναν* Jd. vi. 3 B, *ἐλάμβαναν* 1 K. viii. 3 A, *κατέβαιναν* 1 K. xxv. 20 A, *διέβαιναν* 2 K. ii. 29 B, *ἔφεραν* iii. 22 B, *ἦγαν* vi. 3 B, *ἀνέψυχαν* xvi. 14 A (*-ξαν* B): ℵ has similar forms in *ἤθελαν* Is. xxviii. 12, *ἐδίωκαν* 1 M. xi. 73, *ἐλέγαμεν* 4 M. xiii. 2.

5. Side by side with the termination **-αν** in the 3rd plur. of the old 2nd aorists and the imperfect appears the longer termination **-οσαν**. Though the examples in the papyri are not very numerous[2], the very strong attestation of this form in the LXX leaves no doubt as to its antiquity. It seems to have

[1] The earliest exx. cited are from Asia, *παρείληφαν* (Lydia) 246 B.C., *ἀπέσταλκαν* (Lydia) 193 B.C., Dieterich *Untersuch.* 235 f. In Egypt the form does not appear before 162 B.C., *εἴληφαν*, *ἐπιδέδωκαν* BM i. 17. 23, 49: in iii/B.C. always *εἰλήφασι* etc.

[2] Mayser 323. The narrative and historical element in the papyri is comparatively small and there is not often occasion in petitions etc. to use the 3rd pers. plural of the past tenses.

preceded the use of *-αν* in these tenses and to owe its popularity if not its origin to a desire to discriminate between the 1st pers. sing. and the 3rd pers. plur. This was done by retaining the *ο* and appending the 1st aor. termination *-σαν*.

In the earliest papyri exx. a slightly different ending is used, viz. *-εσαν*: *ἐλαμβάνεσαν* BM i. 18, 31 (161 B.C.), *ἀφίλεσαν* ib. xli. 15 (same date). The connecting vowel *ε* in this tentative form perhaps comes from the 3rd *sing.*: *ἐλάμβανε—ἐλαμβάνε|σαν*[1]. A single ex. of this form occurs in LXX: *κατεφάγεσαν* Jer. x. 25 ℵ*Q (*-ον* BA).

The form *-οσαν* was transitional and has not, with one exception, survived, like the forms in *-αν*, in modern Greek. The exception is the imperfect of contract verbs, where the use of the *-αν* termination was out of the question. In this tense modern Greek has not only retained the 3rd plur. in *-ούσαν(ε)* but has modelled the rest of the tense upon it: *(ἐ)ρωτοῦσα -σες* etc.

Dieterich *Untersuch.* 242 f. traces the origin of *-οσαν* to Boeotia[2]. His statement that its use in Egypt is limited to the imperfect is incorrect: besides *ἀφίλεσαν* referred to above 2 exx. of *-ήλθοσαν* occur at the end of ii/B.C. (Mayser 323), apart from later exx.: *ἐπήλθοσαν* BU 36 (no date), 436 (ii/ or iii/ A.D.).

These forms in *-οσαν* are exceedingly frequent in LXX, being distributed over all the translations (excepting one group) from the Hexateuch to 2 Esdras: the latter book with Joshua (B text) supplies the greatest number of instances. The exceptional group is 1—4 K.: the *-οσαν* forms are entirely absent from 1, 3 and 4 K. (except *ἡμάρτοσαν* 3 K. viii. 50 A): in 2 K. A again supplies one instance of aorist, *ἐξήλθοσαν* ii. 13, B has *ἐλάβοσαν* v. 21, and BA have one ex. of the imperfect of a contract verb, *ἐνοοῦσαν* xx. 15. On the other hand, as has been seen, it is just in this group that the termination *-αν* is specially frequent.

Exx.[3] (1) *Aorist.* *-ήλθοσαν passim* e.g. Ex. i. 1 BAF, Dt. i. 24 BAF (it is observable that in the Pentateuch BAF unite in

[1] Both forms had a precedent in the 3rd plur. of the imperf. of verbs in *-μι*: *ἐδίδοσαν, ἐτίθεσαν*.

[2] Cf. note 1 on p. 210.

[3] Cf. with the list in 2 above, p. 211 f.

attesting the *-οσαν* form only in the opening of these two books and at the end of Deut.: *εὕροσαν* Dt. xxxi. 17 BAF, *ἡμάρτοσαν* xxxii. 5 BAF) etc. etc. *-ηγάγοσαν* Jos. vi. 23 B, x. 23, Jer. xxxiii. 23 *bis* B, 1 Es. i. 17 B, 19, Jdth xii. 5 etc. *ἡμάρτοσαν* Is. xxiv. 6, xlii. 24 etc. *(παρεν)εβάλοσαν* Ex. xvii. 1 B, Jd. xv. 9 A, xviii. 12 A, Jer. xliv. 21, 2 Es. xxi. 30 etc. *(ε)ἴδοσαν* Dt. vii. 19 B*, x. 21 B, Is. xxii. 9, Ψ lxxvi. 17, 2 Es. iii. 12, Cant. vi. 8 *passim*. *εἴποσαν* R. iv. 11 *bis* B, BA, 2 Es. v. 4 B, xi. 3 B etc. *καθείλοσαν* Jos. viii. 29 B, Is. xxii. 10. *εὕροσαν* Ex. xiv. 9 B, Jos. ii. 22 B, Hos. xii. 4, Jer. ii. 5, xiv. 3, 1 Ch. iv. 41 etc. *-έσχοσαν* 1 Es. vi. 5, 2 Es. xiii. 5 BℵR. *ἀπεθάνοσαν* Bar. ii. 25. *-ελάβοσαν* Dt. i. 25 B, Jos. x. 28 B, Jd. i. 6 B, R. i. 4, Zech. i. 6, Jer. xxxiii. 8, Ez. xxxii. 24, 2 Es. ix. 2 etc. *-ελίποσαν* Ex. xvi. 24 B, Dt. xxix. 25 B, Jer. vi. 15. *ἐπίοσαν* Jer. xxviii. 7, xlii. 14 BℵR, 1 Es. iii. 3 B. *ἐφάγοσαν* Gen. xviii. 8, Ex. xvi. 35 B, Jos. v. 11 B, 1 Es. iii. 3 B, vii. 13, 2 Es. xix. 25 etc. *-εφύγοσαν* Jos. x. 27 B, 2 Es. xxiii. 10.

(2) *Imperfect.* (*a*) Uncontracted verbs. *ἤροσαν* Jos. iii. 14 B (*ἦραν* AF). *ἤσθοσαν* Ez. xxii. 9 B*Q (imperfects in *-ον -ουν* and *-οσαν -οῦσαν* are used indiscriminately in this chapter). *ἀπεθνήσκοσαν* Tob. vii. 11 AB[a] (*-ον* B*). *εκλαίοσαν* Dan. Ο Sus. 33. *ἐκρίνοσαν* Ex. xviii. 26 *bis* B, Jer. v. 28. *-ελαμβάνοσαν* Jer. v. 26, Ez. xxii. 12 *bis*. *ἐλέγοσαν* N. xxxii. 5 A (*-ον* BF). *κατελύοσαν* Jer. v. 7 Q (*-ον, -οντο* cett.). *ὑπερίπτοσαν* 4 M. vi. 25 ℵ. *ἐξαπεστέλλοσαν* Ez. xxiii. 40 AQ (*-ον* B). *ἐφαίνοσαν* 1 M. iv. 50 A. *-εφέροσαν* Ex. xviii. 26 B, Jos. xxiv. 33a B, 1 Ch. xxii. 4 B (*ἐφόρασαν* A) (contrast *ἔφερον* 2 Ch. i. 17 etc.). *ἐνεχρίοσαν* Tob. ii. 10 ℵ.

(*b*) Contracted verbs: **-οῦσαν** (**-ῶσαν**). *-ενοοῦσαν* Ex. xxxiii. 8 B, 2 K. xx. 15 BA. *ἐπηξονοῦσαν* N. i. 18 B. *ἐπολεμοῦσαν* Jd. xi. 5 A. *ἠνομοῦσαν* Ez. xxii. 11. *ἐθυμιῶσαν* Jer. xi. 12 ℵ, xxxix. 29 BℵA, cf. 2 Ch. xxx. 14 (B writes *εθυμιωσιν sic*). *εἰ θηνοῦσαν* Lam. i. 5 BAQ*. *ἐθρηνοῦσαν* 1 Es. i. 30 B. *ᾠκοδομοῦσαν* (*οἰκ-*) 2 Es. vi. 14 A[vid], xiv. 18 BℵA. *ἐδολιοῦσαν* Ψ v. 10, xiii. 3. *εὐλογοῦσαν* ib. lxi. 5 B*ℵ*A. *ἐποιοῦσαν* Job i. 4 B*ℵ*, 1 M. xiv. 36 A. *ἐταπεινοῦσαν* Jdth iv. 9 BA. *ἐθεωροῦσαν* ib. x. 10 A. *(παρ)ωκοῦσαν* Dan. Ο Sus. 28, 1 M. xiv. 34 A. *ἐζητοῦσαν* 1 M. xvi. 22 A. *ὡμιλοῦσαν* Dan. Ο Sus. 57. *παρετηροῦσαν* Dan. Θ Sus. 12. *Ἐῶσαν* Jer. xli. 10 is the single ex. from a verb in *-άω*, see § 16, 5.

6. The termination *-σαν* is further used in LXX, as in Hellenistic Greek generally[1], for the 3rd plur. of the **imperative**, to the exclusion of the older forms in *-ων -όντων* etc.

[1] From 300 B.C. in Attic Inscriptions: Meisterhans 167.

Exx.: ἔστωσαν Gen. i. 14 etc., γενηθήτωσαν ib., θανατούσθωσαν L. xx. 10 ff.

7. It appears also in the **optative**, where -οισαν -αισαν replace the older -οιεν -αιεν (-ειαν).

Exx.: αἰνέσαισαν Gen. xlix. 8, ποιήσαισαν Dt. i. 44, 3 K. xix. 2 A, xxi. 10 A, ἔλθοισαν Dt. xxxiii. 16 and probably 7, ἐνέγκαισαν Is. lxvi. 20, εὕροισαν Jer. ii. 5 A (read εὕροσαν with BℵQ), εἴπαισαν (εἴποισαν) Ψ xxxiv. 25 *bis*, ἐκλ(ε)ίποισαν ciii. 35, ἐκκόψαισαν (-κολάψαισαν A) and καταφάγοισαν Prov. xxiv. 52, ψηλαφήσαισαν Job v. 14 Bℵ, θηρεύσαισαν xviii. 7 BℵC, ἔλθοισαν 9 and 11 BℵC, ὀλέσαισαν 11 B^{b}ℵ (-σαιαν B*, -σιαν A, -σαιεν B^{a}) and xx. 10 BℵC, πυρσεύσαισαν xx. 10 BC(ℵ), ἴδοισαν xxi. 20 BℵC, φάγοισαν xxxi. 8 BℵC, εὕροισαν Sir. xxxiii. (xxxvi.) 11, εὐλογήσαισαν Tob. iii. 11 BA. The exceptions to the rule are found in 4 Maccabees which uses the strict Attic forms (e.g. φάνοιεν, θάνοιεν iv. 23, θέλοιεν v. 3, μιεροφαγήσαιεν, ἀντιλέγοιεν viii. 2) and Cod. A in Job, which has ἴδοιεν in xxi. 20 and forms in -(ε)ιαν elsewhere, θηρεύσιαν xviii. 7, ἀπώσιαν xviii. 18, θλάσιαν xx. 10.

The 2nd and 3rd sing. of the 1st aor. optat. similarly end in -αις -αι (for the stricter Attic -ειας -ειε).

The writer of 4 Macc. again shows his Atticizing tendency in using the older forms of the 3rd sing., e.g. νομίσειεν iv. 13, ἐπιτρέψειεν 17, συγγνωμονήσειεν v. 13 etc., and perhaps also of the 2nd sing., ἐκκόψειας v. 30 ℵ, τήξειας ib. $ℵ^{c.a}$, καταφρονήσειας v. 10 $V^{rescr.}$ Job also supplies ἀπώσειεν xviii. 18 BℵC, θηλάσειεν (?Θ) xx. 16 BℵC.

8. **2nd pers. sing. in -ες for -ας** in 1st aor. and perfect. These forms are but slenderly attested in LXX (mainly in the untrustworthy Cod. A) and in the Ptolemaic papyri and clearly did not take root in Egypt. They are interesting however as precursors of modern Greek which in the two past tenses (impf. and aor.) writes -α -ες -ε -αμε -ετε -αν, i.e. in the conflict between the terminations of 1st aor. and 2nd aor. (impf.) the α of the 1st aor. has succeeded in ousting the ο of the 2nd aorist, but the forms in which the 2nd aor. (or impf.) had ε have remained unaltered[1].

[1] See Dieterich op. cit. 239. He speaks of the mod. Greek forms -ες -ε -ετε as the last remnants of the strong aorist active. But they may

In LXX: *ἀπέσταλκες* Ex. v. 22 A, *οἶδες* 2 K. ii. 26 A, *ἔδωκες* Ez. xvi. 21 A, 2 Es. xix. 10 A, *ἐφύλαξες* Job xiii. 27 A, *ἀφῆκες* Tob. xi. 2 B. So in the plur. *ὑπερβεβήκετε* 3 M. vi. 24 V. (*Ἔκρινες* Job x. 2 A [*-νας* cett.] and *ὑπερῆρες* Prov. xxix. 47 ℵ [*-ῆρας* cett.] may be true imperfects.)

In papyri: *παρέσταλκες* PP ii. 20, 4, 15 (252 B.C.) is the only early example which I have noted. *Παρείληφες* occurs in 2 B.C. (OP iv. 742, 4): in ii/ iii/A.D. exx. begin to accumulate, *δέδωκες*, *οἶδες*, *ἔγραψες*, *ἐποίησες* etc.

9. In the **pluperfect** the (3rd) plural has been assimilated to the singular, i.e. *-εισαν* etc. are written, not Attic *-εσαν* etc., even in the literary books[1]: e.g. *(καθ)ιστήκεισαν* Gen. xviii. 2, 3 M. ii. 33 etc., *ἐπεποίθεισαν* Prov. xxi. 22 etc., *ἐπεπόνθεισαν* W. xviii. 1: *ᾔδειμεν* Gen. xliii. 7 etc., *ᾔδειτε* Dt. xiii. 13, *ᾔδεισαν* Gen. xlii. 23 etc.

10. **-εντο for -οντο.** The 3rd plur. of the 2nd aor. act., as we have seen, took over the *-αν* of the 1st aor. In the 2nd aor. *mid.* in *-όμην* the *o* was, in one instance at least, eliminated in another way, the 3rd plur. being modelled on the 3rd sing. in *-ετο*. *Ἐπελάθεντο* is the predominant form in LXX: Jd. iii. 7 A, Jer. iii. 21 B*א, xviii. 15 B*אA, xxiii. 27 B*א, xxvii. 6 אA, xxxvii 14 א, Hos. xiii. 6 B*, Ψ lxxvii. 11 B*. So in N.T. Mc. viii. 14 B*.

Ἐπελάθοντο without variant only in 1 K. xii. 9, Ψ cv. 13, 21, cxviii. 139, Job xix. 14 (cf. Job Θ xxxix. 15).

11. The habit of appending an irrational final *ν* (or *ς*) has already been referred to (p. 135): further exx. are *ἀντελάβοντον* 3 K. ix. 9 A, *ἐπορεύθηταν* Jer. li. 23 ℵ* (for *-ται* or *-τε*), *ἐπιστράφητες* Jer. iii. 14 ℵ*.

12. **2nd person sing. mid. (present and future).** The competition here lay between three rival terminations, *-ῃ*,

owe their origin rather to the *imperfect*, *ἔλυες*. The *-ε* of the third sing. which was alike for all past tenses affected the preceding person, and the 2nd sing. again reacted on the 2nd plur.

[1] In the Ptolemaic exx. (end of ii/B.C.) the 3rd plur. is written with *-ησαν*, which was probably indistinguishable in pronunciation from *-εισαν* (§ 6, 20): *-εσαν* was still used by literary writers like Polybius and Josephus (Mayser 324).

-ει and -σαι. (i) The older Attic -η, used for all verbs in -ω, arose by contraction out of a primitive -σαι (φέρεσαι = φέρεαι = φέρῃ), which was retained in the -μι verbs (ἵστασαι etc.). (ii) Later Attic writers from iv/B.C., when ηι ει were becoming indistinguishable, wrote -ει or -η indifferently. Some of these -ει forms (βούλει, οἴει, ὄψει) were widely adopted in the κοινή. But (iii) the preference of the κοινή for uniformity led ultimately to the reinstatement of the primitive forms in -σαι (on the model of the perf. pass. in -μαι -σαι -ται) and these are universal in modern Greek.

In the conflict between the -η and the -ει forms the LXX uncials on the whole support the older -η forms for pres. and fut.: Cod. B, however, has a considerable number of -ει forms. It is hardly possible to decide which form is original.

Βούλει is consistently written by B: Ex. iv. 23 (-η A) viii. 2 (-η AF) ix. 2 (-η A) x. 3 BA, 7 BA, 3 K. xx. 6 (-η A), Est. iii. 11 B𝔎A. Οἴει also is well attested in the few passages where this literary word occurs: Est. ix. 12, Job xxxiv. 17 A, xxxvii. 23 B𝔎A (-η C), xl. 3 B (-η 𝔎), Dan. O ii. 11 (but οἴῃ Job xxxiv. 12 B𝔎AC). On the other hand ὄψῃ and ἔσῃ largely preponderate over the -ει forms which are limited to a few passages in the B text: ὄψει Ex. vi. 1, 2 K. iii. 13, Ez. viii. 13, 15, Bar. iv. 25 (with Q), ἔσει 2 K. v. 2, 23 (παρέσει), Ez. xxiv. 17, xxxviii. 9: elsewhere they are written by a later hand or hands of B in place of -η of B*.

The use of -ει and -η is a distinguishing mark between the two portions of 2 K. which I have called K. ββ and K. βγ (B text).

ἔσει 2 K. v. 2, παρέσει v. 23.	ἔσῃ 2 K. xiii. 13, xiv. 2, xv. 33, xviii. 3, xix. 13, xxii. 27.
ὄψει iii. 13.	
εἰσελεύσει v. 6.	ἐλεύσῃ xiv. 3.

The termination -η also to some extent supplants -ασαι in some deponents of the -μι type.

Ἐπίστῃ (poetical and apparently Ionic) for ἐπίστασαι is well supported in several LXX books: Gen. xlvii. 5 BA, N. xx. 14 BAF, Jos. xiv. 6 BA, Jer. xvii. 16 B𝔎 (-ασαι AQ), Ez. xxxvii. 3 BA (-ασαι Q), Tob. v. 5 𝔎 and apparently Job xxxviii. 4 εἰ ἐπίστῃ B (-ασαι A): ἐπίστασαι appearing in Dt. (xx. 20, xxviii. 33,

36), Job (xi. 9 A -σε, xxxii. 22 ℵ*, xxxvii. 16 A, xxxviii. 20 BℵAC, 33 BℵA) and Dan. Θ (Sus. 43).

The only instance where δύνῃ (poetical and late prose) appears to be ind. (and not conj.) is Dan. O v. 16: elsewhere δύνασαι: δύνῃ should probably be regarded as from δύνομαι, see § 23, 4.

The reversion to the primitive 2nd sing. termination in -σαι for all middle verbs seems to have begun with certain futures formed from the 2nd aor. (πίομαι, φάγομαι) and with contract verbs. In LXX πίεσαι has entirely superseded πίῃ (Dt. xxviii. 39, R. ii. 9, 3 K. xvii. 4, Jer. xxix. 13 AQ, Ez. iv. 11 etc.) and φάγεσαι is generally written outside the Pentateuch (R. ii. 14, Is. lx. 16, Ez. iv. 9 ff. etc., Mic. vi. 14, Sir. vi. 19, 2 M. vii. 7 V).

Φάγῃ however is constant in the Pentateuch (Gen. iii. 14, 17 ff., Ex. xxxiv. 18, L. vii. 11, Dt. vii. 16, viii. 9 etc. to xxviii. 53) and is found also in 2 K. ix. 7, 4 K. vii. 2 B (φάγῃς A) and perhaps ib. 19 οὐ μὴ φάγῃ (or conj.) and xix. 29 A.

The LXX proper appears to afford only one certain ex. in the case of contract verbs (analogous to ὀδυνᾶσαι, καυχᾶσαι of N.T.) viz. κτᾶσαι Sir. vi. 7; in Gen. xxxii. 10, where A has ἱκανοῦσαί μοι, the impersonal use of the verb elsewhere favours the reading of *D*E ἱκανοῦταί μοι: A again has κοιμᾶσαι in Dt. xxxi. 16, where κοιμᾷ BF is doubtless original: ἀπεξενοῦσαι (no doubt, with Schmiedel, we should read ἀποξενοῦσαι = -ξενοῖ) occurs in 3 K. xiv. 6 A in a passage interpolated from Aquila. The classical termination is kept in Ψ li. 3 ἐνκαυχᾷ.

13. The first hand of B apparently wrote the poetical form of the 1st plur. mid. in Jer. li. 17, ἐγινόμεσθα.

§ 18. Verbs in -Ω. Tense Formation.

1. **Verbs with pure stem** in the κοινή sometimes retain a **short vowel** in the formation of the tenses. Of contracts in -έω (Att. fut. -ήσω) πονέω in LXX always has the tenses πονέσω (Is. xix. 10, Sir. xiii. 5) ἐπόνεσα (1 K. xxiii. 21 etc.):

φορέω has φορέσω (Prov. xvi. 23) ἐφόρεσα (Sir. xi. 5)[1]. Στερέω, on the other hand, keeps the Attic long vowel (e.g. Gen. xxx. 2, xlviii. 11) except in N. xxiv. 11 B*, Sir. xxviii. 15 B*ℵA, Est. E. 12 ℵ*, 3 M. v. 32 V (ἐστερέθης). Cf. the shortening of the vowel in ὀφειλέσει Tob. vi. 13 B (-ήσει ℵA, and so elsewhere in LXX) and in ἐρρέθην, which is always so written in LXX (Gen. xv. 13, 2 K. v. 6, Jon. iii. 7, Dan. O vii. 23, Dan. Θ Sus. 27)[2]: the unaugmented parts of the verb, however, keep η, ῥηθείς—ῥηθῆναι—ῥηθήσομαι: the shortening appears therefore in this instance to be due to assimilation of vowels flanking ρ. Ποθέω (ἐπι-) in the aor. has the long vowel only (ἐπ)επόθησα (Att. also -εσα).

In contracts in -άω a similar shortening takes place in πεινᾰ́σω, ἐπείνᾰσα[3]: διψάω however keeps η except in Is. xlix. 10 οὐ πεινάσουσιν οὐδὲ διψάσουσιν B*ℵ*Q: see § 22, 2.

2. **Formation of passive tenses (1 aor., fut., perf.) with or without σ.** Attic practice in this matter was not uniform and shows many exceptions to the general rule[4]: in the κοινή there is a marked tendency to insert σ where it was not used in the older language.

Insertion of σ contrary to Attic practice. Ἐπαινεσθήσομαι has very strong support, Ψ xxxiii. 3 BℵA, xliii. 9 BℵR, lxii. 12 BℵR, lxiii. 11 BℵR, Sir. ix. 17 BℵA: so ἐπηνέσθησαν Eccl. viii. 10 C (but ἐπηνεθ. BℵA as in Attic: this was one of the cases where the Attic forms did not conform to the general rule). The LXX examples of the older Attic ἐδυνήθην (usually written ἠδ. § 16, 3) and the Ionic ἐδυνάσθην (ἠδ.: in Attic not

[1] Out of these aorists have come the modern Greek presents πονέζω, φορέζω.

[2] Later hands of B twice alter to ἐρρήθην.

[3] Modern Greek hence forms two new presents πεινάζω, διψάζω.

[4] Viz. that pure verbs which retain a short vowel in the tense stem strengthen this vowel by σ, while a long vowel in the stem dispenses with it: Kühner-Blass § 242. In some Attic verbs the σ appears in the aorist only, but not in the perfect: Rutherford *NP* 97 ff. has some suggestive remarks on the subject.

before Xen.) are about equal, the proportion being 32 : 29. Ἰάσθησαν 3 M. v. 18 A = εἰάσθησαν (from ἐάω) stands for Attic εἰάθησαν (so V ἰάθ.). Attic ἠλάθην (ἐλαύνω) again broke the general rule as to short vowels: LXX has the later form συνελασθέντων 2 M. v. 5, with pluperf. συνήλαστο ib. iv. 26 (Att. ἐλήλαμαι, ἠληλάμην). Συνεσχέσθη is read by A in 2 K. xxiv. 21, 25 (-εσχέθην, -σχεθήσομαι are the usual forms of these late tenses in LXX and elsewhere). Ἐζωσμένος (ἀν- δι- περι-) is universal in LXX and is perhaps Ionic: Inscriptions and the testimony of Photius establish ἔζωμαι as the true Attic form (cf. ζῶμα)[1]. From κεράννυμι we find both the usual Attic forms κεκραμένος Dt. xxviii. 66 A (but read κρεμαμένη B), Jer. xxx. 10 B*A (read κεκαρμένους B^{ab}ℵQ), συγκραθῆναι Dan. O ii. 43, and the later perfect κεκέρασμαι Dan. O Bel 33 with the kindred aorist (συν)εκεράσθην Dan. O Bel 11, 2 M. xv. 39, for which there is some classical authority. Ἐκλαύσθην Ez. xxiv. 16 AQ*, 23 A and κλανσθήσομαι Ψ lxxvii. 64 B*ℵT are κοινή forms (B* keeps the Attic κλαυθῇς in the first passage: κλαυθήσονται B^{corr}R in Ψ is obviously a correction). Κλείω (ἀπο- κατα- συγ-) now takes σ not only in the aor. ἐκλείσθην (Att. ἐκλήσθην) with κλεισθήσομαι, but also in the perf. κέκλεισμαι (Att. κέκλημαι: κέκλειμαι only in Ez. xlvi. 1 B* [contrast xliv. 1 f.], Dan. Θ Sus. 20 and perhaps 1 K. xxiii. 7 A ἀποκέκλιται, unless the perf. of -κλίνω is intended)[2]. From λούω (Att. λέλουμαι ἐλούθην) we now have ἐλούσθης Ez. xvi. 4 B*AQΓ and λελουσμέναι Cant. v. 12 B (-ουμ. Aℵ). Ὠνάσθην Tob. iii. 8 B*A (ὠνομάσθης ℵB^{corr}) replaces ὠνήθην Xen. (ὠνάθην Theocr.): the older Attic used the 2nd aor. ὠνήμην. The Attic πεπείραμαι 1 K. xvii. 39 and ἐπειράθην 1 M. xii. 10 (cf. i. 15 ℵ^{corr}) from πειράομαι are used with act. meaning "try": ἐπειράσθην W. xi. 9,

[1] Meisterhans 185, Rutherford *NP* 99.

[2] But the Ptolemaic papyri which have only κέκλ(ε)ιμαι cast doubt on the authenticity of the uncial evidence: Mayser 376. Josephus writes κέκλεισμαι, Schmidt 470 f.

Dan. Θ xii. 9 is correctly formed from πειράζω and has pass. meaning "be tried" or "tempted": the act. meaning therefore establishes the readings ἐπειράθη Sir. xxxi. 10 BA (-άσθη ℵ), π(ε)ιραθῖσα 4 M. xv. 16 ℵV (-ασθ. A). Διαπεπετασμένος 3 K. vi. 33 etc. from -πετάζω "spread" may be paralleled in early poetry (Oracle ap. Hdt. i. 62) for Att. πέπταμαι (πετάννυμι); ἐπετάσθην (ἐξ- κατ-) and πετασθήσομαι are now commonly used as the tenses of πέταμαι (class. aor. ἐπτόμην or ἐπτάμην). Σέσωσμαι, the Hellenistic form of perf., is usual in LXX: the Attic σέσωμαι[1] appears 3 times in B* (1 K. xxiii. 13 δια-, 2 K. i. 3 δια-, Jer. li. 14 ἀνα-), once in A (Jd. xxi. 17); the Attic ἐσώθην, σωθήσομαι are retained.

Κέχρισμαι and χρῖσμα replace Attic κέχριμαι, χρῖμα: ἐχρίσθην is Attic[2], and χρισθήσομαι Ex. xxx. 32 is correctly formed from it. The MSS are divided between συνεψήσθην and συνεψήθην[3], Jer. xxii. 19, xxix. 21, xxxi. 33—both late forms: Attic used perf. ἔψηγμαι from ψήχω, and presumably ἐψήχθην, though found first in Hellenistic Greek, was the older aorist.

Omission of Attic σ is occasionally attested in words with long vowel or diphthong in the stem, in which the Attic σ was therefore contrary to the general rule: ἐγνώθη 2 K. xvii. 19 B, γνωθήσεται Is. lxi. 9 B*: κελευθέντες 4 M. ix. 11 A (-ευσθ. ℵ): θραυθήσεται Is. xlii. 4 B*, cf. θραυμός Na. ii. 11 ℵ* (θραυσμός cett.), θραῦμα Jdth xiii. 5 B (elsewhere θραῦσμα): but usually ἐγνώσθην, γνωσθήσομαι, ἐθραύσθην etc. as in Attic. Ἐξεσπαμένος Zech. iii. 2 B* is probably a slip for the usual -εσπασμένος.

For Attic ἐσβέσθην (usual in LXX) we find the following varieties: ἐσβήθη Job iv. 10 C, σβενθέντος W. ii. 3 ℵ, ib. σβενσθ. A (σβεσθ. B).

[1] Οἱ παλαιοὶ ἄνευ τοῦ σ...οἱ δὲ νεώτεροι σέσωσμαι Photius ap. Rutherford *NP* 99. The later form was constantly written by scribes in MSS of Attic writings, and even the LXX exx. may not be authentic: Ptolemaic papyri keep the Attic form in the few passages where the perf. pass. occurs (Mayser 134).

[2] Ἐχρήθη 2 K. i. 21 A (θυρεὸς Σ. οὐκ ἐχρ. ἐν ἐλαίῳ) is unparalleled, whether intended as from χρίω (=ἐχρίθη) or from χράομαι. Ἐχρίσθη is clearly right.

[3] Cf. περίψημα Tob. v. 19.

3. **Verbs with mute stem.** Attic verbs in -ζω for the most part have a dental stem and therefore have future and 1st aorist in -σω -σα (σ = δσ etc.): others have a guttural stem and form these tenses with -ξω -ξα (ξ = γσ or κσ). In the *κοινή* confusion was to be expected: there was a tendency to substitute ξ for σ, but only in a rather limited group of verbs, in many of which there is early authority for the guttural in derivative nouns. The majority of the -ζω verbs have retained the old σ in fut. and 1st aorist to the present day[1]. The LXX agrees for the most part with the N.T.[2]

(i) The following have passed over to the guttural class. Νυστάζω (ἐπι-) has *νυστάξω* Is. v. 27, Ψ cxx. 3 f., *ἐνύσταξα* 2 K. iv. 6 etc. (*ἐνύστασα* in Attic Comedy and the Anthology: but cf. the early derivatives *νυσταγμός -ακτής*). Παίζω (ἐμπαίζω) always has *-παίξομαι -έπαιξα -πέπαιχα -πέπαιγμαι* (cf. Attic *παίγνιον*: of the Attic forms *ἔπαισα πέπαικα -αισμαι* the only trace is the v.l. *ἔπαισεν* Sir. xlvii. 3 C): a change was in this case called for in order to discriminate between *παίζω* and *παίω*, the tenses of which in Attic were indistinguishable.

(ii) The converse substitution of σ for ξ occurs in the following 1st aorists (under the influence of the futures which take the "Attic" asigmatic forms *σαλπιῶ, συριῶ*, § 20, 1 (i): the fut. is unattested in classical Greek): *ἐσάλπισα* (Att. *ἐσάλπιγξα*): *ἐσύρισα* Lam. ii. 15 f., Ez. xxvii. 36 (Att. *ἐσύριγξα*: cf. *σῦριγξ*).

(iii) In the following there is fluctuation in LXX.

(*a*) Verbs which in Att. have dental stems, aorist *-σα*. Ἁρπάζω keeps the Att. forms *ἁρπάσω, ἥρπασα, διηρπάσθην* 3 M. v. 41, *διηρπασμένος*, but has the new Hellenistic guttural tenses (δι)ηρπάγην W. iv. 11, Sir. vi. 2, Tob. i. 20 and *διαρπαγήσομαι* Am. iii. 11 etc. (cf. Attic *ἅρπαξ, ἁρπαγή*). Βαστάζω keeps Att. *βαστάσω* in 4 K. xviii. 14 and *ἐβάστασα* in 2 K. xxiii. 5 A (*βλαστήσῃ* B), Job xxi. 3 A (*ἅρατε* cett.), Dan. Θ Bel 36: the later *ἐβάσταξα*[3] occurs in Jd. xvi. 30 B, R. ii. 16, Sir. vi. 25.

[1] Hatzidakis 134 ff. He gives reasons for rejecting the theory of Doric influence, of which there are very few traces in the *κοινή* (p. 18). Mayser 360 ff. gives no examples of the new ξ forms from the Ptolemaic papyri, but the tenses of the principal verbs affected seem to be unrepresented in any form.

[2] Blass N.T. § 16, 2.

[3] In the papyri of the Imperial age this (with *ἐβαστάχθην*) is frequent and almost the invariable form from ii/A.D. onwards. Of *ἐβάστασα* I have

Ἀποκνίζω has Att. *-κνίσω, -έκνισα* in L. i. 15, v. 8, 4 K. vi. 6 B, Ez. xvii. 4: A reads *ἀπέκνιξεν* in 4 K. l.c.

(*b*) Verbs which in Att. have guttural stems, aor. *-ξα*. Στηρίζω (*ἐπι-*: Att. tenses *ἐστήριξα -ιξάμην -ίχθην -ιγμαι -ίγμην*). The LXX asigmatic fut. *στηριῶ* (no class. fut. attested) produces the aorists *ἐστήρισα passim* (*ἐστήριξα* only in Dan. O vii. 28 and as a v.l. in Ψ xxxvii. 3 T, l. 14 RT, Jer. xxi. 10 ℵ$^{c.a}$Q) and *ἐστηρισάμην*: the passive tenses are usually guttural *ἐστηρίχθην -ιγμαι -ίγμην*, but the *σ* occasionally intrudes here too[1]: *ἐστηρίσθην* Is. xxxvi. 6 BΓ, Sir. xxxix. 32 ℵ*, 1 M. ii. 49 ℵ, *ἐστήρισμαι* L. xiii. 55 BA (*-ικται* F), 1 K. xxvi. 19, Jdth viii. 24 Bℵ, 1 M. ii. 17 ℵ, xiv. 26 ℵ, 4 M. xvii. 5: the late fut. pass. appears as *-στηριχθήσομαι* in Jd. xvi. 26 B, Sir. xv. 4 B, as *στηρισθήσομαι* in Sir. l.c. ℵAC. Φρυάττειν (class. fut. *-άξομαι*) has 1st aor. *ἐφρύαξα* Ψ ii. 1: in the perf. pass. the uncials diverge, *πεφρυασμένου* 3 M. ii. 2 A *-αγμένου* V.

The tenses of the majority of *-ζω* verbs retain their Attic forms e.g. (*a*) *ἥρμοσα, ἐσκεύασα, ἐσπούδασα, ἐχώρισα*, (*b*) *ἔσφαξα*.

4. **Verbs with liquid stem** in *-αίνω, -αίρω* in Attic have 1st aorist in *-ᾶνα -ᾶρα* where the preceding letter is *ι* or *ρ* (e.g. *ἐμίανα, ἐξήρανα*), otherwise generally[2] *-ηνα -ηρα*. The *κοινή* begins to extend the aorists with *α* to *all* verbs of this type[3], and in modern Greek they are nearly universal[4]. In LXX we have *ἐθέρμανα*, (*ἐξ*)*εκάθαρα* (*-ηρα* Jos. v. 4 A), *ἐλεύκανα* Jl. i. 7, *ἐσήμανα* Jd. vii. 21, Jer. iv. 5, vi. 1, Dan. O ii. 15, 23, 45, Est. ii. 22 (but *ἐσήμηνα*[5] 1 Es. ii. 4, *ἐπεσημήνω* Job xiv. 17—literary books), *ὕφανα* (*συν-*) Ex. xxxvi. 10 etc., *ἔφανα* (*ἐκφᾶναι, ἐπίφανον* etc.) *passim* (but the literary forms *ἀποφῆναι* Job xxvii. 5, *ἀπέφηνεν* ib. xxxii. 2, *ἀπεφήνατο* 2 M. vi. 23, *ἀποφηναμένων* ib. xv. 4).

noted two exx. only: OP iii. 418 (i/-ii/-A.D.), BU 195 (161 A.D.). To judge from Mayser's silence, the verb is not used in the Ptolemaic papyri.

[1] Similarly for the usual form *στήριγμα* we have *στήρισμα* 1 M. vi. 18 A, which is also perhaps the true reading in 2 Es. ix. 8 (so Swete: *σωτήρισμα* B*).

[2] But *ἐκέρδανα, ἐκοίλανα* etc. are Attic: Kühner-Blass I. ii. § 267, 1, Rutherford *NP* 76 ff.

[3] Thus assimilating the aorist to the future stem. It is the converse process to the employment of gen. *-ης* dat. *-ῃ* for all 1st decl. nouns in *-ᾱ́* (§ 10, 2).

[4] Hatzidakis 286 "heute sind überall nur die Formen mit α bekannt," but see Thumb *Handbuch* 87 f. for surviving examples of *-ηνα*.

[5] Similar fluctuation between *ἐσήμανα -ηνα* in the papyri: Mayser 360.

In addition to the literary exceptions noted above we have **ἐρυθήνας** W. xiii. 14 and always the Attic aor. mid. **ἐλυμηνάμην** (2 Ch. xvi. 10, Ψ lxxix. 14, Am. i. 11, Is. lxv. 8 etc.)[1].

In the *perfect passive* of liquid verbs in -αίνω -ύνω ν before μ was usually in Attic altered to σ, probably on the analogy of the perfect pass. of verbs in -ζω (πέφασμαι like ἐσκεύασμαι)[2]: the κοινή on the other hand preferred the more regular assimilation of νμ to μμ. In LXX the Pentateuch translators keep the Att. ὑφασμένος (δι- συν-) Ex. xxviii. 28, xxxvi. 31, L. xix. 19. In other verbs μμ is preferred: ᾔσχυμμαι 1 Es. viii. 71, κατ-ηισχυμμένος Ψ lxxiii. 21 (Epic): μεμακρυμμένος Ψ lv. tit. (-σμ- Aristot.): μεμιαμμένος (Att. -σμ-) N. v. 13 f., 27, W. vii. 25, Tob. ii. 9, Hg. ii. 13 BAQ (-σμ- ℵΓ), 3 M. vii. 14 A (-σμ- V): μεμολυμμένος (no early form), 1 Es. viii. 80 A (-σμ- B), Is. lix. 3 ℵAQ* (-σμ- B), lxv. 4 BℵAQ, 2 M. xiv. 3 V (-σμ- A): πεπληθυμμένος 1 K. xxv. 10, Lam. i. 1 *bis* (no early pf. pass. attested).

The σ in διεσπαρσμένους Is. lvi. 8 A has no *raison d'être*: elsewhere we have the Att. (δι)εσπαρμένος.

§ 19. Verbs in -Ω. Present Tense.

1. The present meaning regularly attaching to certain perfects caused the evolution in the later language[3] of new present forms out of the perfect forms. In the LXX we have **γρηγορέω** (with tenses ἐγρηγόρουν, γρηγορήσω, ἐγρηγόρησα -ήθην) Jer. v. 6, xxxviii. 28 *bis* (ἐγρηγορήσω ℵ*), Bar. ii. 9, Lam. i. 14, 2 Es. xvii. 3 γρηγορούντων ℵA (ἐγρηγορούντων B), 1 M. xii. 27, Dan. Θ ix. 14: the perfect ἐγρήγορα, which it replaces and which is absent from N.T., is confined in LXX to Jer. i. 12, li. 27. Similarly as from **πεποιθέω** we find ἐπεποίθησα in Jd.

[1] Is this another instance, as in the verbs in -μι (§ 23, 1), of the old forms retaining their place longest in the middle voice? But λοιμανάμενοι occurs in a papyrus of ii/B.C., Mayser ib.

[2] Kühner-Blass § 264, 7.

[3] But, as Blass points out, the beginnings go back to an earlier age: γεγωνέω (beside γέγωνα) is as old as Homer.

ix. 26 A, Zeph. iii. 2 AQΓ (ἐπεποίθει BN), Job xxxi. 24 (cf. in the later versions e.g. Ψ ix. 11 πεποιθήσουσιν α′ σ′). **Στήκω** (παραστήκω) is not so well attested as in N.T. (Paul uses the imperat. frequently), occurring as a variant only in the following passages: Ex. xiv. 13 στήκετε A (imperat. = στῆτε BF), Jd. iii. 19 παραστήκοντες A, xvi. 26 στήκει B, 3 K. viii. 11 στήκειν B (στῆναι A), x. 8 παραστήκοντες A (-εστηκότες B), Zech. iv. 14 παραστήκουσιν Γ (cf. N. vii. 2 παρεστήκοντες *sic* A [-κότες BNF], and in the Hexapla Jos. x. 19 στήκετε α′θ′ imperat.). **Ἐκέκραγον** in Isaiah's vision (Is. vi. 3 f., 3 M. v. 23) should perhaps be regarded as an imperf. of †κεκράγω rather than, as Veitch takes it, a reduplicated 2nd aorist (= Att. ἔκραγον).

2. A few instances occur of the formation of new presents or the recrudescence of old dialectic presents in -(ν)νω. With these may be classed sporadic instances of the doubling of the ν in old forms in -νω. **Ἀποκτέννω** (for -κτείνω = κτενγω: old dialects, but cf. also ἀποκτ(ε)ίννυμι in Plato etc.) is a fairly frequent variant. Ex. iv. 23 B (-κτενῶ AF), Dt. xxxii. 39 B (do.), Jos. viii. 24 BAF, 2 K. iv. 12 B* (3 K. xi. 24 A from Aquila), 4 K. xvii. 25 BA: Hb. i. 17 BQ, Is. lxvi. 3 BNAQ: 1 Es. iv. 7 B*, Ψ lxxvii. 34 B*NRT (ἀπέκτενεν B[?vid]), c. 8 B*RTN[c.a] (-έκτινον N*, -έκτενον A), Prov. xxi. 25 N[c.a]: Tob. iii. 8 N *bis*, vi. 14 f. N, xiv. 11 N, W. xvi. 14 (ἀποκτενι N), 3 M. vii. 14 A, 4 M. xiii. 14 N (Dan. Θ ii. 13). The Hellenistic and modern form **χύ(ν)νω** (for χέω), which in N.T. is fairly common (ἐκχύννομαι), in LXX is confined to a single late passage, 3 K. xxii. 35 ἀπεχύννετο (cf. 2 K. xiv. 14 Θ ἐκχυνόμενον). **Ἀποτιννύω** (Gen. xxxi. 39, Ψ lxviii. 5, Sir. xx. 12) for ἀποτίνω (usual in LXX) seems to be a mixture of -τίννω (= -τίνϝω) and -τινύω: the υ appears in the old poetical ἀποτίνυμαι (-τίνν.).

The form **-βέννω** (for -βαίνω = -βανγω: assisted by the itacistic interchange of αι and ε, as in -βένω Gen. xli. 3 E, 1 K. ix. 26 A, 1 M. vii. 40 V, ix. 66 A) is practically confined to portions of Cod. A, which has it in Gen. ii. 6, xli. 2, 5, 18 f., N. xxxiii. 51,

xxxv. 10, Dt. i. 41, iii. 21, iv. 26, xi. 8, 29, 1 K. i. 3, v. 5, 3 K. xxii. 6: in the later books only in Na. ii. 8 (with ℵ), Jer. xxviii. 14, xxix. 2 (with ℵ), xxxi. 35 (where the form may go back to the compiler of Jer. *a* and Jer. *β*), 1 M. vi. 48: in other MSS, Gen. xix. 28 E, Sir. ix. 13 C.

φθάννω is read by AC in W. xvi. 28, Eccl. viii. 14 and by BA in Dan. Θ viii. 7.

3. The following miscellaneous examples occur of the evolution of a new present out of the aorist, the substitution of -ω for -μι (for which see further § 23), etc.

Βιβρώσκω, a rare present for which LS quote Babrius, occurs in the B text of Samson's riddle Jd. xiv. 14 *τί βρωτὸν ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ βιβρώσκοντος...*; the repetition of the root makes the conundrum more pointed.

Βλαστάνω, through the influence of fut. -*ήσω* and new 1 aor. *ἐβλάστησα* (§ 21, 1), gives place to **βλαστάω**, Eccl. ii. 6 *δρυμὸν βλαστῶντα* + *ξύλα* ℵA, and **βλαστέω** W. xviii. 2 *βλαστοῦσιν* ℵ* (read *βλάπτουσιν* BA).

For **ἀλήθω** (*vice ἀλέω*) see § 24: for *δύνομαι* § 23, 4: for *εἰδήσω, εἴδησα* as from †*εἰδέω* § 24 s.v. *οἶδα*.

Ἐνδιδύσκω (2 K. i. 24, xiii. 18, Prov. xxix. 39, Sir. l. 11: and as v.l. of A *ἐνεδιδύσκετο* Jdth ix. 1, x. 3) and **ἐκδιδύσκω** (1 K. xxxi. 8, 2 K. xxiii. 10, 2 Es. xiv. 23, Hos. vii. 1) supplant the classical presents -*δύω* -*δύνω*. The new forms appear to be introduced to mark the transitive meaning of the verb: *δύνειν* remains with intrans. sense "set" 2 K. ii. 24, 3 K. xxii. 36, 2 Ch. xviii. 34 A, Eccl. i. 5, "escape," Prov. xi. 8 *ἐκ θήρας ἐκδύνει* (*δύνει* A).

Ἔσθω or *κατέσθω* (class. poetry and late prose) occurs frequently beside the Attic prose form *ἐσθίω* in certain portions of LXX, especially Pentateuch, Prophets and Psalms: on the other hand *ἐσθίω* is used exclusively in literary books such as Job and Dan. Θ and almost exclusively in the later historical group (always in 1—4 K. except *ἔσθων* 1 K. xiv. 30 BA, *ἔσθοντες* 3 K. iv. 20 A).

It is noteworthy that the form without ι is preferred in the participle *ἔσθων -οντος* etc. which is so written in 37 instances, whereas the cxx. of this spelling in other parts of the verb amount to 9 only (*ἔσθετε -ται* 6, *ἔσθῃ -ητε* 2, *ἤσθοσαν* 1 = Ez. xxii. 9 B*Q); on the other hand *ἐσθίεις, ἐσθίει, ἐσθίειν* are invariable, and the imperf. is always *ἤσθιον* except in Ez. *loc. cit.* Note e.g. in Prov. *ἔσθων* xiii. 25 beside *ἐσθίει* xxiii. 7, *-ίειν* xxv. 27, in Eccl. *ἔσθοντες* v. 10 beside *ἐσθίουσιν* x. 16.

For (*ἐπαν*)*ιστάνω* see § 23, 3.

Κρεμάζω ("Byz." LS) for *κρεμάννυμι* occurs in Job Θ xxvi. 7 *κρεμάζων* BℵC: *κρεμνῶν* of A seems to be unparalleled (*κρεμάω* from Aristotle onwards).

Κρύβω for *κρύπτω*, formed from the Hellenistic aorist *ἐκρύβην*, occurs in the simple form (not, as LS, "only found in compounds *ἀπο- ἐγ- κρύβω*") in 4 K. xi. 3, Jer. xxxix. 27 ℵ (*κρυβήσεται* cett.) and in what appear to be Hexaplaric interpolations in the A text of 1 K. xxiii. 23, 1 Ch. xxi. 20 (= B *μεθαχαβείν*). Aquila has *ἀποκρύβειν*.

Λιμπάνω (Ionic, Hippocrates) is found sporadically in composition: *καταλιμπάνω*[1] Gen. xxxix. 16 (contrast 13 and 15 *λείπω*), 2 K. v. 21, 3 K. xviii. 18 B (with assimilation *καταλειμμάνειν* A, not else attested): *ἐκλιμπ.* Zech. xi. 16: *ἐγκαταλιμπ.* Ψ cxviii. 53: *διαλιμπ.* Tob. x. 7 $B^{b}A$ (*διελίπανεν* B*). Cf. the new form *ὀπτάνεσθαι*, § 24 s.v. *ὁρᾶν*.

Reduplication is dropped in **μνήσκομαι** (cited from Anacreon by Veitch, who compares *ὑπομνήσκουσα* Orphic Hymns): Is. lxii. 6 B*, 1 M. vi. 12 Aℵ, xii. 11 ℵ. (The present *μιμνήσκομαι* itself is not used in Attic prose.) For **νήθω** (*vice νῶ*) see § 24.

Νίπτω (Hellenistic for Attic *-νίζω*) is the only present form used in LXX. For **ὀπτάζομαι, ὀπτάνομαι** see § 24 s.v. *ὁράω*.

Τελίσκω, a rare by-form of *τελέω* (found in ii/B.C. on the Rosetta stone and in the poet Nicander) occurs in the passive

[1] So Thuc. viii. 17 and occasionally in Ptolemaic papyri along with *καταλείπω* which is much more frequent, especially in wills, Mayser 402. See an interesting note of Dr J. H. Moulton on *-λιμπάνω* in the *Classical Quarterly*, vol. II. 138 (April, 1908): further exx. in Anz *Subsidia* 307 f.

in Dt. xxiii. 17^b apparently = "to be initiated." The latter half of the *v.* is a doublet but probably the older version: 17^a reads *πόρνη, πορνεύων* for the *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* (in LXX) *τελεσφόρος, τελισκόμενος* of 17^b.

§ 20. Verbs in -Ω. Future Tense.

1. Blass remarks (N.T. § 18, 1): "The so-called **Attic future** of verbs in *-έω, -άζω* etc. disappears, almost entirely, as the name implies, from Hellenistic Greek, and entirely from the N.T." The tendency was to bring these anomalous forms into line with the other sigmatic futures and so to prevent the possibility of confusion between future and present. The disappearance of the Attic futures was, however, gradual: the *κοινή* even employed some 'Attic' futures from verbs in *-ζω* which were unknown to Attic writers: the LXX, supported by the Ptolemaic papyri, presents some contrasts to the N.T.

(i) Futures in *-ιῶ* from *-ίζω* verbs were the oldest and most widespread of these asigmatic forms, being common to Attic and Ionic[1], and they were likewise the last to disappear. In LXX the futures in *-ιῶ* (*-ιοῦμαι*) are practically used throughout (*ἀφανιῶ, ἀφοριῶ, ἐγγιῶ* etc.) as in the Ptolemaic papyri[2].

In the N.T. the *-ίσω* forms preponderate, and a distinction is observable between the forms used by the writers and those which they incorporate in O.T. quotations: there is a tendency to keep 3rd plur. *-ιοῦσιν* rather than *-ίσουσιν* with double *σ*[3]. In Josephus both forms occur, those in *-ίσω* again preponderating[4].

Futures in *-ίσω* in LXX are mainly variants of the (probably later) A or ℵ text: in B they occur in late books such as Prov. and Eccl., and sporadically elsewhere. The following exx. have been noted. *Αἱρετίσει* Gen. xxx. 20 E: *κουφίσουσιν* Ex. xviii. 22 A, 1 K. vi. 5 A: *σαλπίσεις* N. x. 3 B* (*-ιεῖς* cett., 5 ff. *-ιεῖτε, -ιοῦσιν*), Ez. xxxiii. 3 AQ: *καθαρίσ(ω)* N. xxx. 13 B (*-ιεῖ* AF, and so 9 BAF), Ez. xliii. 26 A, Mal. iii. 3 BA: *ὀρθρίσεις* Jd. ix. 33 A: *πλουτίσει* 1 K. xvii. 25 A: *(δια)στηρίσω* Jer. iii. 12 Q, xvii. 5 BℵA,

[1] K.-Bl. § 227, 4.
[2] Mayser 356.
[3] Blass N.T. ib., WH² App. 170.
[4] W. Schmidt 447 ff.

Sir. xxviii. 1 (where the two forms are combined) *διαστηριῶν διαστηρίσει* BAC: *διασκορπίσ(εις)* Ez. v. 2 B, Job xxxvii. 11 A, Dan. Θ xi. 24 A: *γνωρίσουσιν* Ez. xliv. 23 Q: *διαμερίσετε* Ez. xlvii. 21 BA: *ἀφανίσ(ω)* 2 K. xxii. 38 A, Jl. ii. 20 ℵ*, Ψ cxlv. 9 A: *συμποδίσουσιν* Zech. xiii. 3 ℵ$^{c.b}$: *θερίσ(ει)* Prov. xxii. 8 BℵA, Eccl. xi. 4 BℵAC, Job iv. 8 C: *ὑπερασπίσει* Prov. xxiv. 28 A, W. v. 16 ℵ*, *συνασπίσειν* 3 M. iii. 10 V: *καταποντίσουσιν* Eccl. x. 12 ℵA: *κομίσεται* Sir. xxix. 6 Bℵ (*-ιεῖται* A): *φωτίσω* 2 Es. xvii. 65 (*-ίσων*), Bar. i. 12 (*-ίσῃ* A), Ep. J. 66 B: *ψωμίσω* Dan. Θ iv. 29 and Θ iv. 22 A.

(ii) Verbs in *-άζω* in classical Greek take the 'Attic future' in a few instances as a by-form beside the future in *-άσω*. In LXX the contracted fut. is common in verbs of this type and is extended to verbs with long stem-syllables, *ἁρπάζειν* etc., in which Attic always employed fut. in *-σω*[1].

The following exx. of fut. in *-ῶ* receive some support in earlier (Attic or Ionic) Greek.

ἀναβιβῶ[2] Gen. xlvi. 4 *D*F.	*ἀναβιβάσ(ω)* ib. A.
	Ex. iii. 17.
	Is. lviii. 14 *-σει* (*-σῃ* ℵ).
Ez. xxxix. 2 B.	Ez. ib. AQ.
Am. viii. 10.	
ἐπιβιβ(ῶ) Hos. x. 11, Hb. iii. 15 *-ᾶς* B*ℵ*, *-ᾷ* ib. 19.	
καταβιβῶ Ez. xxvi. 20 A.	*καταβιβάσω* Ez. ib. BQ, Jer. xxviii. 40 ℵ*.
	-άσουσιν Dt. xxi. 4, Ez. xxviii. 8, xxxii. 18.
συμβιβῶ Ex. iv. 12 F.	*συμβιβάσ(ω)* ib. BA, iv. 15, L. x. 11 *-σεις*.
Ψ xxxi. 8 BℵAR.	*-άσω* ib. U.
-βιβάεις sic Dt. iv. 9 A*.	*-άσεις* ib. BF.
-βιβᾷ Is. xl. 13 B*ℵ*Q*.	*-άσει* ib. Aℵ$^{c.a}$Q^{mg} (with 1 Cor. ii. 16 quot.).
παραβιῶνται[3] Am. vi. 10 BQ.	
ἐκδικᾶται[4] L. xix. 18, Dt. xxxii. 43 B (*-εῖται* A), Jdth xi. 10.	*δικάσ(ω)* 1 K. viii. 20, xii. 7 B.

[1] Kühner-Blass § 228. 3 (b).
[2] Attic *-βιβῶ*.
[3] Attic *βιάσομαι* (but see Veitch).
[4] Att. *δικάσω -άσομαι*: Ionic *-δικῶ*.

(ἀπο)δοκιμῶ[1] Jd. vii. 4 A, Jer. ix. 7, xxxviii. 35, Zech. xiii. 9, Sir. xxvii. 5 ℵ* -ᾷ, xxxiv. 26 do.

δοκιμάσ(ω) Jer. ix. 7 ℵ$^{c.a}$, Sir. xxvii. 5 A.

The following are unclassical (Att. -άσω -άσομαι). ἀγορῶμεν 2 Es. xx. 31. ἁρπᾷ, ἁρπᾶται, (δι)αρπῶνται L. xix. 13 B, Ez. xviii. 7, Hos. v. 14, Zeph. ii. 9: class. ἁρπάσ(ω) L. xix. 13 AF, Jd. xxi. 21 A. (κατ)εργᾷ, -ᾶται, -ῶνται *passim*[2]: the class. ἐργάσομαι is never used.

(iii) On the other hand the Attic futures of certain verbs in -άω -έω viz. ἑλῶ (from ἐλάω, ἐλαύνω) καλῶ τελῶ have been replaced[3] by (ἀπ)ελάσω (Ex. xxv. 11, Ez. xxxiv. 12) καλέσω and (συν)τελέσω: present and future were thus clearly differentiated.

In Jer. xiv. 12 συντελῶ ℵ (συντελέσω cett.) may be fut.: καλῶ ib. xxxii. 15 (καλέσω A) xli. 17 is probably present.

For class. fut. χέω, χεῖς, χεῖ (indistinguishable from the present) LXX, differentiating the tenses, has (ἀπο- ἐκ- προσ-συγ-)χεῶ, χεεῖς, χεεῖ etc.; χεῖ Mal. iii. 3 A is apparently intended for the class. fut.

(iv) Ὄλλυμι (ἀπ-) in LXX retains the Attic fut. (ἀπ)ολῶ -οῦμαι: ὀλέσω (Epic and late prose) which is normal in N.T.[4] is confined to Dt. vii. 23 A, Eccl. ix. 18, a gloss in Is. i. 25 (the clause τοὺς δὲ ἀπειθοῦντας ἀπολέσω is absent from MT, and Is. elsewhere uses ἀπολῶ) and Sir. vi. 3 ἀπολέσεις (but ἀπολεῖ vi. 4, x. 3, xx. 22). Ὄμνυμι similarly has fut. ὀμοῦμαι (Ex. xxii. 8, Dt. xxxii. 40, Is. xlv. 23, lxv. 16) not the later ὀμόσω[5].

2. To the liquid verbs which retain asigmatic futures ((ἀπ)αγγελῶ, (ἀπο)στελῶ etc.) there is added a new future, formed from the 2nd aor., ἑλῶ ἑλοῦμαι (ἀν- ἀφ- etc.), which

[1] Ionic: Att. δοκιμάσω.

[2] So in papyri and inscriptions from ii/B.C., Mayser 357: κατασκευᾶν appears even earlier, ib.

[3] So in the Ptolemaic papyri: Mayser 357 cites one iii/B.C. instance of fut. συντελοῦσιν.

[4] Ὀλῶ only in an O.T. quotation (1 Cor. i. 19): but ἀπολοῦμαι still remains.

[5] Ὀμόσω Prov. xxiv. 32 is aor. conj.

has entirely supplanted the old *αἱρήσω*. A similar new fut., formed from the 2nd aor. on the analogy of *ἔπιον πίομαι*, is *φάγομαι*.

The class. *ἔδομαι*, which is absent from N.T., still remains in the LXX, mainly in the Pentateuch, but *φάγομαι* is four times as frequent: the proportion for the simple verb is about 56 *ἔδ.* (40 in Pent.): 225 *φαγ.*; the only book where *ἔδ.* has marked preponderance is Exodus (19 *ἔδ.*, 4 *φαγ.* viz. xii. 8[a], 11[a], 44, xxxiv. 18: contrast Deut. 2 *ἔδ.*, 53 *φαγ.*).

Διαμαχήσεται Sir. xxxviii. 28 is the only ex. of fut. of *μάχομαι* (Att. *μαχοῦμαι*, Ion. *-μαχήσομαι -έσομαι*).

Ἕξω is used to the exclusion of *σχήσω* (§ 15, 3).

3. The **future active** begins to supplant the **future middle** which Attic Greek employed with a certain group of active verbs with quasi-deponent meaning, expressing for the most part a physical action or an emotion[1].

ᾄσω Is. v. 1, Ψ (4 times).	*ᾄσομαι* Jd. v. 3 BA, Is. xxvi. 1, Ψ (6 times).
ἀκούσω 3 times only in B text viz. 2 K. xiv. 16 [but *-σομαι* xvi. 21 etc.], Is. vi. 9 BℵQ (perhaps under the influence of the N.T. quotations in Mt. xiii. 14, Acts xxviii. 26: elsewhere in Is. *-σομαι*), Jer. li. 16 Bℵ[2].	*ἀκούσομαι* (*εἰσ- ἐπ- ὑπ-*) is the normal LXX form.
ἀλαλάξω Is. xli. 1 ℵ, Jer. xxix. 2, Ez. xxvii. 30.	*-άξομαι* A in Jer. Ez. locc. citt.
ἁμαρτήσω Sirach (vii. 36, xxiv. 22).	*-σομαι* elsewhere in LXX.
ἀπαντήσω and *συναντήσω* Ex. v. 3 AF, Is. xxxiv. 14.	*-σομαι* are both equally represented.
	-σομαι 9 times.
ὑπαντήσω Sir. xv. 2 ℵA.	*-σομαι* ib. BC, Dan. Θ x. 14.

[1] Kühner-Blass § 323: Rutherford *NP* 377 ff.

[2] Also as a variant or in Hexaplaric interpolations in A and ℵ: 3 K. viii. 42 A (?from Aquila), Jer. xi. 3 ℵ, Mic. iii. 7 AQ, Ψ cxliv. 19 ℵ, Prov. xxviii. 17 a ℵ, Job xxxvii. 23 ℵ: in Ez. viii. 18 AQ *οὐ μὴ εἰσακούσω* (from Theod.) the verb is no doubt conj.

βαδιῶ Jer. xxx. 3 ℵ*.	else *βαδιοῦμαι*[1].
βιώσω Prov. vii. 2, Job xxix. 18, 4 M. vi. 20 (*ἐπιβ.*).	
-βλέψω rarely: L. xxvi. 9, Is. vi. 9 (as in the N.T. citations: see above on *ἀκούσω*), lxvi. 2, v. 12 ℵ*, Ez. xxxvi. 9, Zech. i. 16 B*, Tob. xi. 8 ℵ, Job Θ x. 4 A.	*-βλέψομαι* usually (Dt., 1 and 3 K., 2 Ch., Is., Min.)
-βοήσω rarely, usually with v.l.: L. xxv. 10, Jos. vi. 10 B, Is. v. 29 f. BℵΓ, xxxiv. 14 ℵ, xlii. 11 BℵΓ (*-σομαι* 8 times in Is.), Lam. iii. 8, 1 Ch. xvi. 32 A, 1 M. iv. 10 ℵ.	*βοήσομαι* usually.
-γελάσω Job xxi. 3 B, 4 M. v. 28.	*-σομαι* elsewhere in LXX.
θαυμάσω (Ionic) L. xix. 15 (*-σῃς* F), Dt. xxviii. 50, Job xxi. 5 B (*-σατε* ℵA), Is. xiv. 16 ℵAQΓ (*-σονται* B).	*-σομαι* L. xxvi. 32, Job xiii. 10, Is. xli. 23, lii. 15, Jer. iv. 9.
κύψω Ψ ix. 31.	
οἰμώξω 4 M. xii. 15.	
ὀλολύξω Is. xvi. 7, lxv. 14, Am. viii. 3.	
ἐμπαίξω Is. xxxiii. 4 Bℵ*Q, Job xl. 24 A.	else (*ἐμ*)*παίξομαι*.
πνεύσω Ψ cxlvii. 7 (perhaps causat. "make to blow"), Sir. xliii. 20.	*-σομαι* Sir. xliii. 16.
σιγήσω Ex. xiv. 14, Sir. xx. 7.	*-σομαι* Lam. iii. 49.
σιωπήσω Is. lxv. 6 BℵQ (*-σομαι* A), Sir. xx. 7 ℵ.	else *-σομαι* Is. xlii. 14, lxii. 1, 6 etc.
(*τρέχω*) *δραμῶ* Cant. i. 4[2].	else *-δραμοῦμαι*.
φθάσω (Ionic, Xen.) Eccl. xii. 1, *προφθάσω* 4 K. xix. 32, Sir. xix. 27, Ψ lviii. 11 etc.	[Attic *φθήσομαι* not used.]

With some verbs Attic preferred fut. mid. but also employed fut. act. So in LXX (*κατα*)*διώξω -ομαι* are both used (but only *ἐκδιώξω*): similarly *ζήσω* (causatively Ψ cxxxvii. 7, cxlii. 11 *ζήσεις με*) 4 K. xviii. 32, Prov. ix. 11 Bℵ, Am. v. 6 A, Sir. xxxvii. 26 A and (commonly) *ζήσομαι*. The fut. act. only is used in the

[1] The later *βαδίσομαι -ίσω* are not found in LXX.

[2] And perhaps 2 K. xviii. 19, 22 (*δράμω* Swete).

following verbs (class. prefers mid.): *γηράσω* (Job xxix. 18), *γρύξω*, *ἐπαινέσω*, cf. *ἁρπάσω* 1 (ii) above.

Many middle futures remain unaltered e.g. *γνώσομαι*, *δήξομαι*, *ἀποθανοῦμαι*, *κλαύσομαι* (not *-σω* as in N.T.), *κεκράξομαι* (for *κεκράξετε* Jer. iv. 5 B𝔖 read *κεκράξατε* AQ: the unreduplicated *-κράξομαι* is a v.l. in 1s. xlii. 2 A, Jer. xxix. 2 𝔖*, Jl. iii. 16 𝔖$^{c.a}$AQ, Hb. i. 1 B*𝔖^{c}: the later *κράξω* is not found), *λή(μ)ψομαι*, *μαθήσομαι*, *εἴσομαι*, *ὄψομαι*, *πείσομαι*, *ῥυήσομαι* (not the rarer Attic *ῥεύσομαι*, nor the later *ῥεύσω*), *τέξομαι*, *τεύξομαι*, *φεύξομαι*.

The converse use of fut. mid. for class. act. occurs in the two new futures of *χαίρειν*, *χαρήσομαι* and *χαροῦμαι* (Att. *χαιρήσω*: see § 24). Cf. *διψήσομαι* Is. lxv. 13 𝔖*A.

§ 21. Verbs in -Ω. First and Second Aorist (and Future Passive).

1. **Sigmatic 1st aorist for 2nd aorist.** As has been stated elsewhere (§ 17, 2), the encroachment of the 1st aorist *terminations* in *-α* (*-αν* etc.) into the sphere of the old 2nd aorist began in a few instances in Attic Greek: in the *κοινή* these terminations were rapidly extended to other verbs and in modern Greek they are universal in the past tenses. On the other hand the instances where the old 2nd aorist was replaced in the *κοινή* by an entirely new 1st aorist in *-σα* were few, and the later language has not advanced much further in this direction[1]. The few examples supplied by the N.T.[2] may be illustrated from the LXX, some of them, however, only from the later books.

(˚**Ηξα**)[3] for *ἤγαγον* (the latter *passim* in LXX) occurs in the compound *συνῆξα* (mod. Gr. *ἐσύναξα*) in Jd. xi. 20 B (*-ήγαγεν* A), 2 Es. (vii. 28, viii. 15, xvii. 5), 1 M. i. 4 A𝔖V (beside *συνήγαγον* elsewhere in these three books): also in *ἐπάξαι* Est. ix. 25 (and perhaps *ἐὰν δ' ἐπάξω* Ez. xxii. 13 B: in *ὁρᾶτε μὴ...ἐπάξω* Ex. xxxiii. 5 the verb is probably fut.: cf. Jos. ix. 13 *ὅρα μὴ...κατοικεῖς*): *ἄναξον* 1 M. ix. 58 V.

[1] Thumb *Handbuch* 89 "Nur in einigen Fällen hat der sigmatische Aorist sich auf Kosten des asigmatischen bereichert."

[2] Blass N.T. § 19, 1.

[3] The form seems to have been first used in the compounds: Mayser 369 cites one Ptolemaic ex. of 112 B.C. *διάξη<σθε>*: *ἵνα...ἄξωμεν* occurs in 2 B.C., OP 742 (= Witkowski 94): exx. accumulate later, Crönert 232 note 2.

Ἡμάρτησα (so mod. Gr. *ἁμάρτησα*) beside *ἥμαρτον*, the normal LXX form, occurs only in Lam. iii. 42 *ἡμαρτήσαμεν*, *ἠσεβήσαμεν* (contrast the same form of confession with *ἡμάρτομεν* in Bar. ii. 12, Dan. ΟΘ ix. 5), Job xv. 11 C (*ἡμάρτηκας* cett.), Eccl. v. 5 *ἐξαμαρτῆσαι* B (in causative sense).

Ἐβίωσα is used (to the exclusion of the usual Attic *ἐβίων*): W. xii. 23, Sir. xl. 28, Prov. ix. 6 A$^{\aleph c.a}$, *διαβιώσῃ* Ex. xxi. 21 BF: but far commoner is *ἔζησα* (Ionic and late: not Attic).

Ἐβλάστησα (usually, if not always, in causative sense) replaces the earlier Attic *ἔβλαστον* throughout: Gen. i. 11 *βλαστησάτω ἡ γῆ βοτάνην*, N. xvii. 8, 2 K. xxiii. 5 B, Is. xlv. 8, Sir. xxiv. 17, xxxix. 13: in comp. with *ἐκ-* Is. lv. 10, Job Θ xxxviii. 27.

Ἔδυν (intrans.) is still commonly retained: *ἔδυ* Gen. xxviii. 11, Jon. ii. 6, Tob. ii. 4, 7, x. 7 ℵ, 1 M. x. 50, xii. 27, *εἰσέδυ* 1 M. vi. 46, *ἐπέδυ* Jer. xv. 9, *δῦναι* Jd. xiv. 18 A, conj. *δύῃ* L. xxii. 7 AF (*δῦ* B*), 2 K. iii. 35: intrans. sigmatic 1 aor. **ἔδυσα** in *ἐὰν... καταδύσωσιν* Am. ix. 3, *ὑποδύσαντες* Jdth vi. 13, asigmatic 1 aor. **δύναντος** 2 Ch. xviii. 34 B (*δύνοντος* A). (*Ἐνέδυσα*, *ἐξέδυσα* in causal sense of clothing, unclothing are classical.)

The class. *ἀνέκραγον* is retained in Jos. vi. 4, 5 (*-κραγέντων* AF^{vid}), Ez. ix. 1, xxi. 12, Zech. i. 14, 17, Sir. l. 16: elsewhere (in the later historical books) **ἀνέκραξα** Jd. vii. 20, 1 K. iv. 5, 3 K. xii. 24 t B, xxii. 32, 1 M. ii. 27, 3 M. vi. 17, so **ἔκραξα** Jd. i. 14, 2 K. xix. 4, Jer. xxii. 20 B, Tob. vi. 3 ℵ, but the 1 aor. of the simple verb commonly takes the reduplicated form *ἐκέκραξα passim.*

Ἔλιπον is practically universal in the LXX, as it actually is in the Ptolemaic papyri[1]: **ἔλειψα** does not seem to have come into general use till the Christian era[2] and in LXX is limited to the B text of Judges (ix. 9, 11, 13, *ἀπολείψασα*=*ἀφεῖσα* A) and to 1 Ch. xxviii. 9 B *ἐὰν καταλείψῃς* (*-λίψεις* A). The constant substitution in A of the imperf. *-έλειπον*, *-ελειπόμην* for *-έλιπον*, *-ελιπόμην* of B may be taken as an indication that the 2nd aorist form had ceased to be familiar at the time when Cod. A or a parent MS was written.

Ἀπέδρασα is confined to two passages in Cod. ℵ: Jdth xi. 3 (*ἀπέδρας* BA), Tob. i. 19 (elsewhere the classical forms *ἀπέδρας*, *-έδρα*, *-έδρασαν*, *ἀπόδραθι*, *διαδράς*).

Ἔφθασα (Attic) is the only aorist of *φθάνω* used in LXX, not the alternative Attic 2 aor. *ἔφθην*.

[1] Mayser 364.

[2] Papyri exx. of *κατέλειψα* from i/A.D. onwards are given in Deissmann *BS* 190, Crönert 234 note 6 (earliest date cited 40 A.D.): cf. Dieterich *Untersuch.* 238. Josephus keeps *κατέλιπον*: Schmidt 458 attributes an occasional *-έλειψα* in the MSS to copyists. From the same source has probably come *παρελείψαμεν* in Polyb. xii. 15. 12.

Εὗρον, not *εὕρησα*, in LXX. For *ἔπεσα* see § 17, 2: for *ἔδωσα*, *ἔθησα* in Cod. A § 23, 10.

2. **Sigmatic for unsigmatic 1st aorist.** New 1st aorists in *-σα* replace in some instances an older unsigmatic 1st aor. The new *ἐγάμησα* occurs without variant in Est. F. 3, in conjunction with Att. *ἔγημα* in 2 M. xiv. 25 (*παρεκάλεσεν αὐτὸν γῆμαι...ἐγάμησεν*), while in 4 M. xvi. 9 both forms are attested (*γαμήσαντες* A, *γήμαντες* ℵV). Similarly *(ἀν)εῖλησα* 4 K. ii. 8, Ez. ii. 10 (Att. *εἶλα*, as from *εἴλω*, Epic *ἕλσα*). *Κατενεμησάμην* Ψ lxxix. 14 replaces Att. *ἐνειμάμην* (but *διένειμα* Dt. xxix. 26) as *νεμήσομαι* Jer. xxvii. 19 etc. replaces *νεμοῦμαι*. A 1st aor. *ὦσα* (Ionic, Hdt. i. 157 *ἀνοῖσαι*) for *ἤνεγκα* appears in Bar. i. 10 *ἀνοίσατε*. The desire for uniformity produces the new 1st aor. *κατασκόπησα* (class. *-σκεψάμην* as elsewhere in LXX): 2 K. x. 3 (with *κατασκέψασθαι* in same *v.*) — 1 Ch. xix. 3, 1 M. v. 38 A (*-σκοπεῦσαι* ℵV).

Ἀνέθαλον (also in N.T.) Ψ xxvii. 7, W. iv. 4, Sir. xlvi. 12, xlix. 10, Hos. viii. 9 is an example of the reverse rare phenomenon of a new 2nd aorist appearing in the later language (but there is no certain early instance of any aorist from this verb: *ἀνέθηλα* is late).

3. **2nd aor. pass. for 2nd aor. act.** In *ἐρρύην* (LXX with class. Greek) we have an early instance of the preference in the case of a *υ* stem for the *passive* aorist in *-ην* with active meaning. The *κοινή* extended this to other *υ* verbs or perhaps revived old dialectic passive forms. So (for Att. *ἔφυν*) *ἀνεφύη(σαν)* 1 K. v. 6, Dan. Θ vii. 8, viii. 9, *προσφυέντος* ib. vii. 20. LXX however retains *ἔδυν* (1 *supra*) and has no instance of *ἐδύην* (as in N.T. Jude 4, with the early ex. of *διεκδυῆναι* in Hippocrates).

Cf. class. *ἐχάρην* and the preference for passive aorists in deponent verbs (6 *infra*).

4. **1st and 2nd aorist (and future) passive.** The

1st aor. pass., like the 1st aor. act., held its own and extended its range in the *κοινή*, and has survived with altered termination in the modern language (*ἐδέθηκα*). In a certain number of words, however, the **1st aor. pass. in -θην was replaced by the 2nd aor. pass. in -ην.** The somewhat surprising phenomenon of the introduction of new passive forms of the strong aorist—a tense which in the active was losing some of its ground—is largely due, no doubt, to the increasing preference in the later language for smooth and easy pronunciation, such as was afforded by the single consonant in the termination of the 2nd aor. pass., and the avoidance of the harsh juxtaposition of consonants, especially of two aspirated letters (*χθ*, *φθ*), which occurred in most of the discarded passive 1st aorists. In the early vernacular and in poetry there are instances of e.g. *ἐκρύφην* (for *ἐκρύφθην*): the *κοινή* sometimes went further and dropped the remaining aspirated letter, writing *ἐκρύβην*, and generally preferred a medial to an aspirated letter as the final sound of the stem[1].

-ηγγέλην[2] (for *-ηγγέλθην*) is universal in LXX: *ἀν- ἀπ-ηγγ. passim*, *δι-* Ex. ix. 16, 2 M. i. 33: fut. *ἀν- ἀπ- δι- αγγελήσομαι* Ψ xxi. 31, lviii. 13, 2 Es. xvi. 7.

ἠνοίγην, fut. *ἀνοιγήσομαι*, are limited to 2 Esd. (xxiii. 19, xvii. 3): elsewhere in LXX the 1st aor. pass. with *χθ* is retained either in the classical form *ἀνεῴχθην* (*ἠν.* § 16, 6) or more often in the new form *ἠνοίχθην* with fut. pass. *ἀνοιχθήσομαι* Is. xxxv. 5, lx. 11, Ez. xliv. 2, xlvi. 1.

ἡρπάγην (*δι-*) W. iv. 11, Sir. vi. 2, Tob. i. 20, with fut. *διαρπαγήσομαι* Sir. xxxvi. 30, Am. iii. 11, Zech. xiv. 2, Dan. Θ ii. 5, iii. 96 A: but the class. *δι-(συν-)ηρπάσθην* is kept by some literary writers, Prov. vi. 25 B**א**, 3 M. v. 41, 4 M. v. 4.

Fut. **ἐλιγήσομαι** Is. xxxiv. 4: the class. aor. is kept in Job xviii. 8 (lit.) *ἐλιχθείη* (*εἰλ.* A).

The class. *ἐκαύθην*, *κανθήσομαι*, in which there was as yet[3] perhaps no clashing of aspirate sounds, are usual in LXX: **ἐκάην** (Epic, Ionic and late writers) appears in Jd. xv. 5 B, 2 K.

[1] Blass N.T. § 19, 3.

[2] A doubtful ex. occurs in Eur. *I. T.* 932, "the only instance in classic Greek" according to Veitch.

[3] Later they came to be pronounced like *ἐκάφθην*, *καφθήσομαι*.

xxiv. 1 (*ἐκκαῆναι*), Dan. O iii. 19 *bis* (Θ ib. *ἐκκαῇ*), 94 (*κοτεκάησαν*), and the fut. (*ἐκ- κατα-*)*καήσομαι* in (Is. xlvii. 14 AQ*: *-καυθ.* BN) Sir. xxviii. 12, 22 f., xl. 30, Tob. xiv. 4 BA (*καυθ.* N).

ἐκρύβην, *κρυβήσομαι*[1] (with compounds) are used throughout, to the exclusion of the classical but ill-sounding *ἐκρύφθην*, *κρυφθήσομαι*: cf. the new present *κρύβω*, § 19, 3.

διαλεγῆναι 1 Es. viii. 45 B has classical authority: A reads *διαλεχθῆναι* and so in 2 M. xi. 20, Est. i. 18 *λεχθέντα* BN, *διαλεχθήσομαι* Sir. xiv. 20 BNC (*-δεχθ.* A).

In **κατελίπησαν** 2 Es. xi. 2 B*[vid] the reading is supported by the fact that this book has in another instance quoted above (*ἠνοίγην*) been found the solitary LXX witness to these late 2nd aor. forms: the other MSS have *-ελ(ε)ίφθησαν*, the classical form of aorist which with *-λειφθήσομαι* is used elsewhere in LXX.

Fut. pass. **νιφήσομαι** L. xv. 12 comes under the same head: the older aor. pass. of *νίζω* (*νίπτω*) was *ἐνίφθην* (Hippocr.), no class. use of fut. pass. is attested.

The Pentateuch uses the 1 aor. pass. *κατενύχθην* (a late compound: no passive tenses are attested in class. Greek of the simple verb) Gen. xxvii. 38 E, xxxiv. 7, L. x. 3: the later books employ **κατενύγην** 3 K. xx. 27, 29, Ψ iv. 5, xxix. 13, xxxiv. 15, Sir. xiv. 1, xlvii. 20, Dan. Θ x. 16 B[ab]AQ, *κατανυγήσομαι* Sir. xii. 12, xx. 21.

(κατ-)ωρύγην[2] Jos. xxiv. 33 a B (class. *-ύχθη* A), Jer. xxxii. 19 (*-ύξωσιν* A), Am. ix. 2 AQ (*-κρυβῶσιν* B), Ψ xciii. 13.

ἐπεσκέπην (*συν-*) (unclass.) is frequent and fut. *ἐπισκεπήσομαι* occurs in 1 K. xx. 18 *bis*: the earlier 1st aor. (*ἐσκέφθην* Hippocr.) is confined to 1 Es. ii. 21 *ὅπως...ἐπισκεφθῇ* "that search may be made" (contrast vi. 21 *ἐπισκεπήτω*), the cognate fut. to Jer. iii. 16 BAQ (*ἐπισκεφήσ.* N*): cf. § 24 s.v. *σκοπέω*.

ἐτάγην (*ἐκ-* 2 M. xv. 20, *ἐπ-* Ez. xxiv. 18, 1 Es. vi. 19 etc., *πρου- συν- ὑπ-*) is usual, with fut. *ὑποταγήσομαι* (Ψ lxi. 1, W. viii. 14, Dan. O vii. 27, xi. 37): the class. 1 aor. pass. is confined to the participle in two literary books which also use the 2 aor.: *ὅταν ἐπιταγῇ...συντελοῦσι τὸ ταχθέν...τὸ συνταχθέν* Ep. J. 61 f., *τὰ προσταχθέντα* Est. i. 15.

Where in classical Greek a verb possessed both 1 and 2 aor. pass., the former, if it contained two aspirated letters, disappears in LXX: so always *ἐρ(ρ)ίφην* (some classical authority), *ῥιφήσομαι* (post-class.), *-εστράφην*, *-στραφήσομαι*, to the exclusion of *ἐρίφθην*[3], *ἐστρέφθην* etc.

[1] An instance in Eur. *Suppl.* 543: the strong aor. in the form *ἐκρύφην* is found in classical poetry.

[2] The *θ* was dropped in the earlier vulgar language: *κατορυχησόμεσθα ποῦ γῆς;* Aristoph. *Av.* 394.

[3] ριφθιc W. xviii. 18 A is clearly a corruption or correction of an original ριφειc.

5. On the other hand the general tendency was to introduce **new first aorists passive**[1] and analogous **futures.** Ἐτέχθην (with τεχθήσομαι) Gen. xxiv. 15, l. 23 etc. and ἀπεκτάνθην 1 M. ii. 9 were in Attic expressed by different words (ἐγενόμην, ἀπέθανον). Ἐκλίθην (poet.) Ψ ci. 12, Sir. xv. 4 (κλισθῇ ℵ) and κλιθήσομαι Ψ ciii. 5 BT replace the usual Att. 2nd aor. ἐκλίνην and κλινήσομαι. Other new or un-Attic forms are ἐβρώθην (Ionic: not ἠδέσθην)—βρωθήσομαι: ἐσχέθην (Ionic: συν- Gen. viii. 2, 2 K. xxiv. 21 [-έσθη A], 25 [do.] etc., κατ- Tob. x. 2 ℵ, 3 M. v. 12 [κατησχέθη A])—σχεθήσομαι (κατ- R. i. 13, συσ- Job Θ xxxvi. 8): in passive sense confined to three books ἐρ(ρ)ύσθην (4 K. xxiii. 18 B, Ψ lix. 7, lxviii. 15 etc., 1 M. ii. 60, xii. 15)—ῥυσθήσομαι (4 K. xix. 11 [in the parallel Is. xxxvii. 11 καὶ σὺ ῥυσθήσῃ; of B is a Hexaplaric addition], Ψ xvii. 30). Other exx. are given in the Table of Verbs (§ 24): a special class of these new forms is dealt with in the following paragraphs.

6. **Aorist (and future) passive for aorist (and future) middle in Deponent Verbs.** Already in classical Greek many deponent verbs, particularly those expressive of emotion, took an aorist passive in *-θην* in place of the aorist middle which from their reflexive or transitive meaning might be expected[2]: the majority, however, of these verbs retained the future middle. This employment of the passive was a first step in the direction of the elimination of the special forms of the middle voice (as in modern Greek) and the use was quickly extended in the κοινή to other verbs: uniformity was also introduced by the substitution of passive for the old middle futures. Two instances of these new passive aorists stand out from the rest by their great frequency.

Ἐγενήθην (with compounds: Ionic, Doric and Hellenistic)

[1] Except ἐτέχθην all the instances quoted have only one aspirated letter.

[2] See the list in Kühner-Blass § 324.

is used interchangeably with the Attic ἐγενόμην throughout the LXX as in the Ptolemaic papyri[1].

The two forms often occur in the same context and it is hazardous to draw distinctions. But, on the whole, there appears to be a tendency to write ἐγενήθην with a predicate and with the more substantive meaning "came," "became," "amounted to," "arose" (e.g. ἐγενήθη ῥῆμα Κυρίου πρὸς Ἀβράμ Gen. xv. 1, τὸ πρωὶ ἐγενήθη Ex. x. 13), whereas the introductory formula "and it came to pass" in certain books at least (Pentateuch, 1 and 2 Ch.) is more often καὶ ἐγένετο: in the Kingdom books this distinction disappears.—Ez. *a* writes ἐγενόμην throughout (except ἐγενήθην xix. 2, xxvi. 1 BQ: also xxvi. 17 AQ, an interpolation from Θ) whereas Ez. *β* uses ἐγενήθην frequently.—In the moods the old forms preponderate (but conj. γενηθῶσιν Dt. xxiii. 8, inf. γενηθῆναι Ex. ix. 28, Jdth xi. 22, xii. 13, part. rarely γενηθείς e.g. Ex. xix. 16: optat. only γενοίμην etc.) except that in the imperat. γενηθήτω is as frequent as γενέσθω and is preferred in the Pent., e.g. γενηθήτω φῶς· καὶ ἐγένετο φῶς Gen. i. 3.—The perf. γεγένημαι, rare in Attic, is also uncommon in LXX, γέγονα being usual (§ 24).—The Att. fut. γενήσομαι is kept: Gen. xvii. 17 *bis*, Eccl. i. 9, 11 (γενηθησ. A), ii. 18 AC (γινομ. cett.).

Ἀπεκρίθην "answered," the usual Hellenistic form, is employed throughout the LXX[2]: the classical ἀπεκρινάμην in the few passages where it occurs seems to be chosen as suitable for solemn or poetical language: Ex. xix. 19 (God is the Speaker: contrast 8 ἀπεκρίθη δὲ πᾶς ὁ λαός), Jd. v. 29 A ἀνταπεκρίναντο, ἀπεκρίνατο (in Deborah's song), 3 K. ii. 1 (David's solemn last charge to Solomon), 1 Ch. x. 13 (not in M.T.: probably a later gloss), ἀπόκριναι Job xl. 2 B (God speaks: ἀποκρίθητι ℵA: ἀπεκρίθη Κύριος xxxix. 31 is from Θ), Ez. ix. 11 (the speaker is an emissary from God). The fut. is ἀποκριθήσομαι.

Similarly ὑπεκρίθην "dissemble," "impersonate," -κριθῇς Sir. i. 29, -κριθείς 2 M. v. 25, -κριθῆναι vi. 21 V (ὑποκρῖναι A) 24 beside -κρίνασθαι (lit.) 4 M. vi. 17: διεκρίθην and διακριθήσομαι "reason" or "plead" (Ez. *a* and Joel), and κριθήσομαι in same sense Job xiii. 19, Jer. ii. 9.

[1] Mayser 379, 362.

[2] It is the only form found in the Ptolemaic papyri, but the instances are few (Mayser 379). Ἀπεκρινάμην continues into iv/B.C. in Attic inscriptions (Meist. 194).

Examples where *verbs expressing emotion* now take on these new forms for the first time are:

ἠσθήθην: *αἰσθηθῇ* Job xl. 18 Bא (*ἔσθηται* A).	but class. *ἠσθόμην* Job xxiii. 5 (*αἰσθοίμην*), Ep. J 40 (*αἰσθέσθαι*), 4 M. viii. 4.
αἰσθηθήσομαι Is. xxxiii. 11 Bא*Q*, Prov. xxiv. 14 B (*αἰσθήσῃ* אA). **αἰσθανθήσομαι** Is. xlix. 26.	for class. *αἰσθήσομαι*.
ἐθαμβήθην[1] 1 M. vi. 8, Dan. Θ viii. 17, 18 A.	Causal *θαμβεῖν*, deponent *-εῖσθαι* are unclass.
μετεμελήθην (Polyb.) 1 K. xv. 35 etc., fut. *-ηθήσομαι* Ψ cix. 4 etc.: so perf. *-μεμέλημαι* 1 M. xi. 10.	Class. Gk uses pres. and impf. only of the personal verb.

Ἠγέρθην (also Attic) is used to the exclusion of *ἠγρόμην*, together with the new fut. *ἐγερθήσομαι*.

On the other hand we have only middle aorists in the following cases: *ἠγαλλιασάμην* (with fut. *-άσομαι*: N.T. has also *ἠγαλλιά(σ)θην*), *ἀπελογησάμην* 2 M. xiii. 26 (*-ήσομαι* Jer. xii. 1: N.T. has besides *-ήθην*), *ἠρνησάμην* Gen. xviii. 15, 4 M. viii. 7 (Attic preferred *ἠρνήθην*: fut. as in Att. *(ἀπ)αρνήσομαι* Is. xxxi. 7, 4 M. x. 15), *ἐμαχεσάμην* (not *ἐμαχέσθην* as in Plut.).

In the following both aor. mid. (rare in class. Greek) and aor. pass. are represented in LXX: *ἠδέσατο* Jdth ix. 3 (else *ἠδέσθην* 1, 2 and 4 M.), *διελέξαντο* Jd. viii. 1 B (but *διαλεχθῆναι* 1 Es. viii. 45 A [*-λεγῆναι* B], 2 M. xi. 20: fut. *-λεχθήσομαι* Sir. xiv. 20 is classical beside *-λέξομαι*).

7. A **new future passive** makes its appearance beside the old classical aorist passive in the following deponent verbs. **Αἰσχυνθήσομαι** Is. i. 29 etc. (the class. fut. of the simple verb usually *-οῦμαι*, but *ἐπαισχυνθήσομαι*): *δεηθήσομαι* 3 K. viii. 33 etc. (class. *δεήσομαι* not in LXX): *ἐνθυμηθήσομαι* W. ix. 13, Sir. xvi. 20 (but class. *ἐνθυμήσεται* Sir. xvii. 31 B*C: *-ηθήσ.* א*AB[a]): *κοιμηθήσομαι passim* (no early attestation for fut. pass. or mid.): *πλαιηθήσομαι* Is. xvii. 11 (class. *πλαιήσομαι*): *φοβηθήσομαι* (doubtful class. authority) is used throughout LXX (except

[1] *Ἐθαυμάσθην, θαυμασθήσομαι* in LXX are used passively only (class.), not as deponents, as in the Apocalypse. Est. C. 21 *ἔθηκεν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν, ἐξᾶραι...ἀφανίσαι...καὶ ἀνοῖξαι...καὶ θαυμασθῆναι βασιλέα σάρκινον εἰς αἰῶνα* is a possible exception: R.V. translates as passive.

4 M. viii. 19 *οὐ φοβησόμεθα* A : *-ηθησ.* ℵ : A is probably right considering the writer's Attic proclivities). *Εὐλαβηθήσομαι, ἐυφρανθήσομαι, ὀργισθήσομαι*, for which there is some classical authority, are used to the exclusion of *εὐλαβήσομαι, εὐφρανοῦμαι, ὀργιοῦμαι.*

The old middle futures are kept in e.g. *δυνήσομαι, πορεύσομαι* : Cod. A supplies instances of the later forms, *δυνηθήσομαι*[1] 1 K. xvii. 33, Jer. v. 22, Ez. vii. 19, *πορευθήσομαι* 3 K. xiv. 2 (interpolation from Aquila), so R. ii. 9 BA (beside *πορεύσῃ* in same *v.*). Further middle futures retained are *βουλήσομαι* Job xxxix. 9, *ἐπιμελήσομαι* Sir. xxxiii. 13[b], *πειράσομαι* 2 M. *bis.*

§ 22. Contract Verbs.

1. **Confusion of forms in** *-άω -έω.* In modern Greek the three old types of contract verbs have practically[2] been reduced to one, viz. a combination of those in *-άω* and *-έω*, in which the forms of the *-άω* class in *ᾰ́* (*ᾱ́*) have been retained, while the *ῶ* of the 1st and 3rd plur. has been replaced by *οῦ* from the *-έω* class : *ῥωτῶ -ᾷς -ᾷ -οῦμε -ᾶτε -οῦν.* The merging of *-άω -έω* into a single class found a starting-point in the forms which were common to the two classes (*τιμήσω φιλήσω*).

In the LXX the old classes are in the main correctly distinguished, but in the Maccabees portion of Codd. Aℵ and elsewhere (rarely in B) we see the beginnings of the process[3] in the confusion of *ω* and *ου* in the imperf., present and participle.

In the following instances *-άω* verbs take on forms from those in *-έω* (*ου* for *ω*). Imperf. (3rd plur.) : *ἐπηρώτουν* 2 M. vii. 7 A (*-ων* V), *ἠρεύνουν* 1 M. ix. 26 ℵ (*-ων* AV), *συνήντοῦ* 1 M. xi. 2 ℵ (*-ων* AV) : (1st sing.) *προσεδόκουν* Ψ cxviii. 166 AR (*-ων* ℵT). Pres. : *τιμοῦσιν* Is. xxix. 13 ℵ*, *θυμιοῦσιν* ib. lxv. 3 ℵ. Part. : *καταβοούντων* 2 M. viii. 3 A (*-ώντων* V), *σιωπούντων* 4 M. x. 18 A (*-ώντων* ℵ).

[1] Cod. A also supplies the only ex. of aor. mid. *ἐδυνησάμην* (poetical) in 1 M. ix. 9 *δυνησώμεθα* (*δυνώμεθα* ℵV). For the usual aor. *ἠδυνήθην -άσθην* see §§ 18, 2, 16, 3.

[2] The type *πατῶ -εῖς* is rare : the *-όω* class has disappeared and made way for new forms in *-ώνω* : Thumb *Handbuch* 112 ff.

[3] The instances multiply in Patristic writings : Reinhold 85 f.

In the following readings *-έω* verbs go over to the *-άω* class (*ω* for *ου*). Imperf.: *ἐδυσφόρων* 2 M. xiii. 25 A (*-ουν* V), *ἐθεώρων* Jdth x. 10 ℵ (*-ουν* B, *-οῦσαν* A), *ἐμίσων* Mal. ii. 13 ℵ* (*-ουν* cett.), *ἠγνόων* W. vii. 12 ℵ$^{c.a\ vid.}$. Pres.: *πτοῶνται* Jer. xxvi. 5 B*ℵA (*-οῦνται* Q), *πατῶσιν* Is. xxv. 10 A. Part.: (*τὸ ἔργον...ἦν*) *ἀργῶν* 2 Es. iv. 24 BA, cf. *λαλοντα* Zech. i. 19 ℵ* (=*λαλῶντα* for *-οῦντα*). Conj.: *ἵνα μὴ...ἐκδικᾷ* 2 M. vi. 15 A (*-ῇ* V).

Ἐλεᾶν has almost entirely supplanted the older *ἐλεεῖν*: the tenses most commonly used (*ἠλέησα ἐλεήσω*) are of course derivable from either.

So with preponderant authority (B^{ab} and occasionally A reading the *-έω* form) *ἐλεᾷ* Tob. xiii. 2 B*ℵA, Ψ xxxvi. 26, cxiv. 5 ℵ (*-εῖ* AT), Prov. xiv. 31, xxi. 26, Sir. xviii. 14: *ἐλεῶσιν* Prov. xiii. 9 a Bℵ (*-οῦσῑ* A): *ἐλεῶντι* Prov. xxviii. 8 B* (*-οῦντι* B^{ab}ℵA): *ἐλεῶντες* 4 M. vi. 12, *ἐλέα* (impt.) ib. ix. 3. The older *-έω* forms are retained in two literary books only: *ἐλεεῖς* W. xi. 23, *ἐλεεῖν* 2 M. iii. 21.

2. **Verbs in -άω.** Ζάω (*ζήω*)[1] keeps Attic *η* and *χράομαι* has Att. inf. *χρῆσθαι* (Est. viii. 11 *bis*, E. 19, ix. 13, W. xiii. 18, 2 M. iv. 19, xi. 31), *χρᾶσθαι* (Ionic and late)[2] only in 2 M. vi. 21 A (*χρήσασθαι* V). But the remaining "*-ήω* verbs," as Dr J. H. Moulton terms them[3], are in the *κοινή* brought into uniformity with other *-άω* verbs. So in LXX *διψᾷ* Is. xxix. 8 (ind.), Prov. xxv. 21 (conj.): *πεινᾷ* Prov. xxv. 21 (conj.), *ἐπείνας* Dt. xxv. 18.

In the last-named verb the *α* further encroaches into the fut. and 1st aor. (§ 18, 1), *πεινάσω ἐπείνασα* always in LXX: similarly *διψάσουσιν*[4] Is. xlix. 10 Bℵ*Q* (elsewhere always *διψήσω* Is. lxv. 13 etc., *ἐδίψησα*).

Κατηρήσατο 3 K. ii. 8 A is the Ionic form (*-άσατο* B is Attic).

3. **Verbs in -έω.** The classical rule that dissyllabic verbs in *-έω* contract only *εε* and *εει* is observed in LXX in the case

[1] The only LXX imperf. *ἔζην* (as from *ζῆμι*) N. xxi. 9, Jos. iv. 14, 2 K. xix. 6 has some classical authority beside *ἔζων*: imperat. *ζῆθι* (similarly formed) Dan. ΘΘ ii. 4 etc. is post-classical.

[2] Καταχρᾶσθαι appears in Egypt as early as iii/B.C. beside *χρῆσθαι*: Mayser 347.

[3] *Prol.* 54.

[4] The reading is supported by the marginal note in Q, *θ′σ′ διψήσ. α′ ὁμοίως τοῖς ο′ διψάσ.*

of πλέω, πνέω, ῥέω in the passages, not very many, where these verbs appear. With δέομαι and χέω, the κοινή, as illustrated by the LXX, shows a tendency to extend the use of uncontracted forms still further[1].

Δέομαι in several instances leaves εε uncontracted (*δέεται*, *δέεσθαι* are attested in MSS of Xenophon, Veitch s.v.). In LXX:

Uncontracted.	Contracted.
ἐπιδέεται Dt. xv. 8 B, 10 B (*-δέηται* AF *bis*).	*δεῖται* Sir. xxviii. 4, Dan. Θ vi. 5.
ἐδέετο Job xix. 16 (*ἐδεεῖτο* A), Jdth xii. 8 B (*ἔδετο* A), Est. C. 14 A.	*ἐδεῖτο* Gen. xxv. 21, Est. C. 14 B ℵ, Dan. Θ vi. 10.
δέεσθαι Ψ xxvii. 2, lxiii. 2.	*δεῖσθαι* Job xxxiv. 20.

A mixture of forms, irregular retention of ε before contracted *εῖ*, is seen in *ἐδεεῖτο* A Job *loc. cit.*, cf. *ἐπιδεουμένῳ* Sir. xli. 2 A (*-δεομένῳ* cett.). More striking is the juxtaposition twice over of a similar form beside an uncontracted εε in Dt. xv. 8 B, 10 B, *ὅσον ἐπιδέεται, καθότι ἐνδεεῖται*. Is this intended for a *future* analogous to the LXX fut. *χεῶ -εεῖς -εεῖ* (§ 20, 1 (iii))?

In **χέω** Attic Greek had already relaxed the rule as to contraction in (i) the syllables *-εε*, which might be contracted or not: but (ii) *-εει* was always contracted. The LXX keeps the open forms also in (ii) in the new future *χεῶ χεεῖς χεεῖ* (§ 20, 1), which was designed to differentiate the fut. from the present: also occasionally in the present, *ἐκχέειν* Jer. xxii. 17 (cf. *present* *ποιεῖν* which follows), *προσχέειν* Ez. xliii. 18 and (apparently not to be accented as futures) *καταχέει* Job xli. 14, *ἐκχέει* Sir. xxviii. 11, *χέει* ib. xliii. 19. As regards (i) diversity still prevails. Contracted are *ἐκχεῖσθαι, διεχεῖτο, ἔγχει* 4 K. iv. 41, *ἐνέχει* ib. iv. 40 B: but uncontracted *ἔκχεε* Jd. vi. 20 B, *ἐκχέετε* Ψ lxi. 9 BR [*θ'* Ez. xxxiii. 25], and *passim* *ἐνέχεεν*. With *διαχεεῖται* L. xiii. 55 A cf. *ἐνδεεῖται* in the preceding paragraph.

Of fluctuation between *-ω* and *-έω* (as in earlier Greek) the LXX affords the following examples.

Ἐπιμέλομαι and *-μελοῦμαι* are both classical: Ptolemaic papyri use the former almost exclusively (Mayser 347 f.). So *ἐπιμέλεσθαι* 1 M. xi. 37 ℵV* (*-μελεῖσθε* A), but *ἐπιμελοῦμαι* Gen. xliv. 21: the frequency of *ἐπιμελόμενος* in the papyri supports the accent *ἐπιμέλου* in Prov. xxvii. 25.

Ἐκπιεζοῦντες Ez. xxii. 29 BA (*-οντες* Q) has Ionic (Hom.

[1] In Patristic writings exx. of *ἀποπλέειν, ἐκπνέειν, κατέρρεε* etc. occur: Reinhold 84 f.

πιέζευν, Hdt. πιεζεύμενος) and Hellenistic authority (Polybius): else in LXX πιέζω (-άζω, § 24).

Ῥιπτέω in pres. and impf. is classical beside ῥίπτω: so in 2 M. (ἐπιριπτοῦντες iii. 26, ἐξερίπτουν x. 30) and Dan. Θ (ῥιπτοῦμεν -οῦντος ix. 18, 20): in Ψ lxxxiii. 11 B reads παραριπτεῖσθαι, the other uncials -εσθαι: elsewhere ῥίπτω ἔριπτον Jer. vii. 29, xliii. 23, xlv. 26, W. xvii. 19.

LXX has στερέω (2 M. xiii. 11, 3 M. ii. 33), προσκυροῦσαν (1 M. x. 39), συγκυρούσαις -οῦντα (N. xxi. 25, xxxv. 4 etc.) only: Ptolemaic papyri have στέρομαι only (class. in pres. and impf.) and usually προσ- συγ- κύροντ(α): Mayser 348.

4. **Verbs in -όω.** These are as a rule regular and unaffected by confusion with the other types, analogous to that which takes place between -άω and -έω verbs. Exceptions[1] are ἐζήλησα Zech. viii. 2 ℵ (-ωσα -ωκα cett.), ἐστραγγαλημένος Tob. ii. 3 AB^{ab} (-ωμένος B*) ἐστραγγάληται ℵ ib.: the converse change is seen in βεβαρωμένος 2 M. xiii. 9 V (-ημένος A).

The inf. is still in -ουν as in the Ptolemaic papyri[2]: the later -οῖν only in ὑψοῖν Tob. xii. 6 B (-ουν A). Cf. the substitution of οι for ου in σφηνοίσθω 2 Es. xvii. 3 ℵ*.

Δηλούσουσιν 1 Es. iii. 15 A, ἐπεπληροῦτο (=-ωτο) 2 M. vi. 4 A may be compared with the exx. of replacement of ω by ου referred to above (1).

For 2nd sing. -ᾶσαι -οῦσαι see § 17, 12.

§ 23. Verbs in -μι.

1. **Transition to the -ω class.** As a consequence of the general tendency of the later language towards uniformity and elimination of real or imagined superfluities, the comparatively small class of verbs in -μι was destined to disappear or rather to be absorbed into the predominant class of verbs in -ω. In modern Greek the absorption is complete. In the LXX the process is only beginning and the -μι forms are still well represented: the transition to the -ω class is less advanced

[1] A further instance probably in ἀθῳωμένη οὐ μὴ ἀθῳωθῇς Jer. xxix. 13 BℵQ (ἀθοουμένη A): the pres. part., not the perfect, is usual in this manner of rendering the Hebrew inf. absolute.

[2] Mayser 349: the earliest ex. of -οῖν to which Dr J. H. Moulton refers me is dated 18 A.D. (BM iii. p. 136 *bis*). The form owes its origin to analogy (λύει : λύειν :: δηλοῖ : δηλοῖν) as explained in his *Prol.* 53 n. 2.

than in the N.T. In particular the *-μι* forms in the middle-passive voice are almost universal. The middle *-μι* forms held out longest, no doubt, because the terminations in that voice differed less widely from the *-ω* type than in the active: *τίθεται*, e.g., could be referred to either type; the comparative rarity of the use of the middle of these verbs, mainly in literary writings, also perhaps contributed to the preservation of the classical forms. The new verbs in *-ω* were not always coined in the same mould. They might be contracts in *-άω -έω -όω*, or they might be mute (liquid) verbs in *-ω*. The three forms of *-μι* verb with infinitives *-άναι -έναι -όναι* perhaps suggested the formation in the first place of contract verbs in *-άω -έω -όω*, which ultimately made way for mute verbs. Thus arose *ἱστάω* —*(ἰ)στάνω* : *τιθέω—τίθω* : *διδόω—δίδω*. In the first of these pairs LXX prefers *ἱστάω*, N.T. *ἱστάνω*.

2. The verbs in *-νυμι* (including *ὄλλυμι* = *ὄλνυμι*) may be considered first because they were the first to succumb, active forms as from *-ύω* appearing already in Attic Inscriptions of v/iv/B.C.[1] In the LXX the *-μι* forms are universal in the middle voice (the instances occur mainly in the literary books), while in the active the *-ω* forms are normal, but not quite to the exclusion of the older type. The distinction between active and middle holds good in the Ptolemaic papyri[2].

Active *-υμι* forms.	Active *-υω* forms.
ἐπιδείκνυμι 4 M. vi. 35: *ὑποδίκνυμεν* 1 Es. ii. 20 A: *ὑποδείκνυτε* Tob. xii. 6 ℵ.	*δεικνύω* Ex. xxv. 8, Ez. xl. 4, Tob. iv. 20 (*ἐπι-*), xiii. 6 BA: *ὑποδεικνύομεν* 1 Es. ii. 20 B: *δεικνύουσιν* 3 K. xiii. 12.
ἐπιδεικνύναι 4 M. xiv. 18.	*ὑπεδείκνυεν* 3 M. v. 29.
δεικνύς W. xiv. 4, xviii. 21: *-ύνταs* Ep. J. 3 (*δικνύονταs* Q*): 2 M. xv. 10 (*παρεπι-*): 3 M. v. 26 *ὑποδεικνύς* A (*-ύων* V), vi. 5 A (*δικνύεις* V).	*δεικνύων* Dt. i. 33, *ὑποδεικνύοντος* 2 Ch. xv. 3 A, *ὑποδεικνύοντες* Tob. xii. 6 BA.

[1] Meisterhans 191. In v/B.C. once *ὀμνύντων*, iv/B.C. *ὤμνυον* (but *ὀμνύναι*), ii/B.C. *στρωννύειν* and from i/B.C. onwards *ὀμνύειν*.

[2] Mayser 351 f.

Middle (all in *-μι*): *ἐνδείκνυσαι* W. xii. 17 (*-νύς* ℵ*): *ἐπιδείκνυσθαι* 4 M. i. 1: *ἐν-(ἐπι-)δεικνύμενος* Prov. xii. 17, Dan. ΟΘ iii. 44, Ep. J. 25, 58, 2 M. ix. 8 A (*-ύοντος* V).

ἀνεζεύγνυσαν Ex. xl. 30 f.

ἀναζευγνύειν Jdth vii. 1.

περιζωννύων Ψ xvii. 33, Job Θ xii. 18 A.

But in the mid. *περιζώννυται* Ψ cviii. 19.

κεράννοντες Is. v. 22 B*ℵ*.

This reading is to be preferred to *κεραννύντες* $B^{ab}ℵ^{c.b}$ Swete (*κεραυνύντες* A). It may be a corruption of an older *κεραννύοντες*; just as the new-formed contract verbs in *-άω* etc. subsequently developed into mute or liquid verbs, so the *υ* in *-ύω* was afterwards eliminated and *ἀπολλύω* became *ἀπολνῶ*, *δεικνύω δείχνω* etc.[1]

Μείγνυμι does not occur in the act., **μίσγω** being used instead (Is. i. 22, Hos. iv. 2: so also imperat. mid. *συναναμίσγεσθε* Ez. xx. 18 B). In the middle the *-μι* forms are retained:—*(προσ)-μίγνυται* Prov. xiv. 13, 16, *ἀναμίγνυται* Dan. Θ ii. 43: *συν(αν)εμίγνυτο* Hos. vii. 8: *συναναμίγνυσθαι* Ez. xx. 18 AQ*.

ὄλλυμι.

ἀπόλλυσι(ν) Prov. xii. 4, xv. 1, 27 (*ἐξόλλ.*), Eccl. vii. 8 B, 2 M. iii. 39 V: *ἀπόλλυμεν* Gen. xix. 13: *ἀπόλλυτε* 1 M. ii. 37.

ὀλλύντα Job xxxiv. 17.

ὀλλύω.

ἀπολλύει Dt. viii. 20, Job ix. 22, Eccl. vii. 8 ℵAC, 2 M. iii. 39 A, Sir. xx. 22 A: *ἐξολλύει* Prov. xi. 17 Bℵ*A (*-υσι* $ℵ^{c.a}$).

ἀπολλύ(ων) Jer. xxiii. 1 BA (*-ύντες* ℵQ), Job (? Θ) xii. 23 $ℵAB^{ab}$ (om. B*), Sir. xx. 22.

ἀπολλύειν Jer. i. 10=Sir. xlix. 7, Jer. xviii. 7.

In the mid. the *-μι* forms are universal: *ἀπόλλυμαι* 1 M. vi. 13, *ὄλλυται (-υνται)* Prov. ix. 18 etc., *ἀπόλλυται* Sir. xvii. 28: *διώλλυντο* W. xvii. 10: *ἀπολλύμενος* Ez. xxxiv. 29, Prov. xvii. 5 etc. (the reading of A in Eccl. vii. 16 *ἀπολλυόμενος* is clearly late).

ὀμνύω Is. xlv. 23 (*-ύων* ℵ*), Bel O 7: *ὀμνύει* Am. iv. 2, viii. 7: *ὀμνύετε* Hos. iv. 15, Jer. vii. 9: *ὀμνύουσιν* Jer. v. 2.

ὤμνυον Jer. v. 7, Ψ ci. 9.

ὀμνύντες Is. xix. 18 B (*-ύοντες* ℵ*Γ, *-ύουσαι* $ℵ^{c.b}$AQ) is the solitary ex. of an active *-μι* form.

ὀμνύ(ων) Is. xlviii. 1, lxv. 16, Min. Proph. (5 exx.), Ψ xiv. 4, lxii. 12, Eccl. ix. 2, Sir. xxiii. 10.

ὀμνύειν Jer. xii. 16 *bis*.

[1] Dieterich 221 f.

The mid. in *-μι*: *ἐξόμνυμαι* 4 M. x. 3: *ὀμνυμένων* W. xiv. 31 (*-νομένων* C): *ἐξόμνυσθαι* 4 M. iv. 26.

Ῥήγνυμι is not used in pres. or imperf., **ῥήσσω** taking its place: 3 K. xi. 31, *διαρρήσσων* ib. 11. The mid. keeps the *-μι* forms: *(κατα)ῥήγνυται* 3 K. xiii. 3, Prov. xxvii. 9, *διερρήγνυντο* 2 Ch. xxv. 12.

Σβέννυντι W. xvi. 17 is the only ex. of the active: in the mid. *σβέννυται* Prov. x. 7, xiii. 9, xxix. 36 (*ἀπο-*), *ἐσβέννυτο* 4 M. ix. 20.

καταστρωννύων Job Θ xii. 23.

New presents in *-άζω* (*-άω*), a natural outgrowth from the aor. *ἐσκέδασα* etc., replace those in *-νυμι* in Theodotion and late versions: (for *κρεμάννυμι*) *κρεμάζων* Job Θ xxvi. 7 BℵC (*κρεμνῶν* A): (for *-πετάννυμι*) *ἐκπετάζω(ν)* Job Θ xxvi. 9, 2 Es. ix. 5: (for *-σκεδάννυμι*) *διασκεδάζει* Ψ xxxii. 10 (but mid. *διασκεδάννυται* Job xxxviii. 24). Cf. *ἀμφιάζω* (Plutarch etc.) for *-έννυμι* (in LXX the aorist only is attested, *ἠμφίασα -ασάμην* or *-εσάμην*).

There is no attestation for pres. or imperf. of *πήγνυμι*.

For the new present *ἀποτιννύω* see § 19, 2.

3. **Transition to the -ω class of verbs in -άναι -έναι -όναι.** **"Ιστημι.** The *-μι* forms of the act. are replaced or supplemented by two new presents, the older contract **ἱστάω** (already used by Herodotus in 3rd sing. pres. and imperf.) and, less often in LXX, the longer **ἱστάνω** (the termination *-νω* became increasingly popular in the later language) which makes its appearance once in a papyrus of iii/B.C.[1] and is used by Polybius and later writers, including those of the N.T. The abbreviated *στάνω* found in MSS of the N.T. is unknown to the LXX. The *-μι* forms in LXX still hold their own in the pres. sing. act. and, excepting the participle, in the middle.

Present. "Ιστημι (compounds included) is the only form in use for 1 sing.: Gen. ix. 9, xli. 41, 2 K. xviii. 12, Jer. li. 11, Dan. O iv. 28, 1 M. xi. 57 *bis*, xv. 5. No form of 2 sing. occurs. For 3 sing. Attic *-ίστησι* is used in the literary books (Prov. vi. 14, xvii. 9, xxvi. 26, xxix. 4, Job v. 18, 2 M. vi. 16), elsewhere compounds of *ἱστᾷ*: *ἀνιστᾷ* 1 K. ii. 8, *ἀφιστᾷ* Sir. xxxiv. 1 BℵC= xlii. 9, *καθιστᾷ* and *μεθιστᾷ* Dan. Θ ii. 21[2]. 2nd plur. *ἵστατε* Jdth

[1] *ἀνθιστάνειν* in the Petrie papyri (Mayser 353). *καθειστᾳ* etc. in papyri of 165, 160 B.C. Aristeas like LXX has both forms: *καθιστῶν* § 228 but *καθιστάνειν* § 280.

[2] Probably also ειcταμε Job xxxi. 6 A should be read as *εἱστᾷ με*, but it does not represent the original text.

viii. 12: 3rd plur. from ἱστάω only viz. διιστῶσιν Is. lix. 2, ἱστῶσιν 1 M. viii. 1, μεθιστῶσιν ib. 13.

Imperfect from ἱστάω only: ἀπεκαθίστων Gen. xxix. 3, συνίστων 2 M. ix. 25.

The *pres. inf.* appears in 3 forms (1) the Attic καθιστάναι 1 M. xiv. 42, 4 M. v. 25 A (-εστάναι ℵ), (2) μεθιστᾶν 3 M. vi. 24, (3) ἱστάνειν Ez. xvii. 14, ἐξιστάνειν 3 M. i. 25.

The *pres. part.* (1) in its classical form only in 2 M. iii. 26 παριστάντες, 3 M. iii. 19 καθειστάντες A (-τῶντες V), (2) elsewhere ἱστῶν with compounds is used *passim*, Dt. xvii. 15, xxii. 4, 2 K. xxii. 34=Ψ xvii. 34, Ψ xv. 5, Job vi. 2, Is. xliv. 26 etc.

A *fut.* **-ιστήσω** occurs once in A, Dt. xvii. 15 καθιστῶν καθιστήσεις (καταστήσεις BF): otherwise the new forms are restricted to pres. and imperf.

In the *middle* the -μι forms are, with the exception noted below, retained unaltered: the imperat. ἀφίστω Sir. xiii. 10 is therefore, probably, the old poetical alternative for -ίστασο and should not be accented, with Swete, ἀφιστῶ (like imperat. τιμῶ), so ἵστασθε Jer. xxviii. 50 Swete (not -ᾶσθε): παριστάσθω 1 K. xvi. 22 is ambiguous: the rare optat. ἐξανισταῖτο 4 M. vi. 8. The part. -ιστάμενος is frequent but the compound **ἐπανιστανόμενος** is a constant variant: so 2 K. xxii. 40 BA (but -ιστάμενος 4 K. xvi. 7 BA): elsewhere there is MS authority for both forms, -ιστανόμενος being apparently the older reading in Ψ (xvii. 40, 49, xliii. 6, lviii. 2 etc.) and Job (xxvii. 7): the true reading being doubtful in Is. ix. 11, Lam. iii. 62, Jdth xvi. 17 and in 3 M. vi. 12 μεθιστανομένους V (-ισταμένους A).

The paradigm for pres. and impf. in LXX is therefore:

Pres. ind.	1 sing. 3 sing. (2 plur. 3 plur.	ἵστημι -ίστησι ἵστατε)	or -ιστᾷ -ιστῶσιν	
Imperf.			-ίστων	
Inf.		-ιστάναι	or -ιστᾶν	or -ιστάνειν
Part.		(-ιστάς 2, 3 M.)	usu. ἱστῶν	
Middle		-μι forms		but ἐπανιστανόμενος (μεθιστανόμενος)

4. Transition to the *-άω* class, as in *ἱστάω*, takes place also in the following verbs. **Κιχρῶ** 1 K. i. 28 BA (Lucianic text *κίχρημι*), 3 sing. *κιχρᾷ* Prov. xiii. 11, *κιχρῶν* Ψ cxi. 5. **Ἐμπι(μ)ράω** (no example of *simplex* in LXX) *ἐνεπί(μ)πρα* 2 M. viii. 6 AV, *ἐνεπίμπρων* x. 36 A (so from Xenophon onwards). **Πίμπλημι** keeps the *-μι* forms twice in Proverbs, but otherwise in the active joins the *-άω* class.

Pres. ind.	*πίμπλησι(ν)* Prov. xviii. 20	*ἐμπιπλᾶς* Ψ cxliv. 16, *ἐμπιπλᾷ* Prov. xiii. 25
Imperf.	*ἐνεπίμπλασαν* Prov. xxiv. 50 (*ἐνεμπίπλ.* A)	*ἐνεμπί(μ)πλων* 3 M. i. 18
Part.		*(ἐμ)πι(μ)πλῶν* Ψ cii. 5, cxlvii. 3, Sir. xxiv. 25
Middle	*-μι* forms: pres. ind. Prov. xxiv. 4, xxvii. 20, Job xix. 22 etc.: pres. conj. Prov. iii. 10: part. Hb. ii. 5, Prov. xxiv. 51, Eccl. i. 7, 2 M. iv. 40	imperf. *ἐνεπιπλῶντο* 3 M. iv. 3 V (A om.)

Φημί so far as used (it is being relegated to the literary vocabulary) is regular, *φησίν* and *ἔφη* being the only forms commonly employed as the rendering of נאם: *φασίν* Ep. J. 19 (in 2 Es. iv. 17 *εἰρήνην καὶ φάσιν*, subst., should be read): *ἔφασαν* Est. x. 11: *ἔφησα* in 2 M. only (3 times): the part. mid. *φάμενος* Job xxiv. 25 is one indication among several of the translator's acquaintance with Homer: a part. act. is occasionally, as in Attic, supplied from *φάσκω*.

Of deponents **ἐπίσταμαι** and *(ἐκ- ἐπι-)***κρέμαμαι** keep the *-μι* forms except that *ἐπίστῃ* is used along with *ἐπίστασαι* (§ 17, 12). So **δύναμαι** is regular except that *δύνομαι*[1] occurs as a v.l. in Is. xxviii. 20 B *δυνόμεθα*, lix. 14 א*vid *ᾐδύνοντο*, 4 M. ii. 20 A *ἐδύνετο*: 2nd sing. *δύνασαι*, once *δύνῃ* (ib.).

5. **Τίθημι, δίδωμι.** The transition to the class of contract verbs (**τιθέω, διδόω**) had already begun in the Attic Greek in the

[1] So in papyri as early as ii/B.C.: Par. 39. 10 [161 B.C.], BM i. 14. 22 [160—159 B.C.]: in papyri dated A.D. the *-ω* forms, *δυνόμενος* etc., preponderate.

imperf. sing. (ἐτίθεις -ει for ἐτίθης -η, ἐδίδουν -ους -ου for ων -ως -ω). So in LXX ἐτίθεις Ψ xlix. 18, 20, ἐτίθει Gen. xxx. 42, Prov. viii. 28 (the older ἐτίθη in Est. iv. 4 A: the plur. of the impf. is unattested): ἐδίδουν -ους -ου, but the 3rd plur. is more often the Attic ἐδίδοσαν (Jer. xliv. 21, Ez. xxiii. 42, Jdth vii. 21, 1 M. x. 41 ἀπ-, 3 M. ii. 31) than ἐδίδουν, which was liable to confusion with 1 sing.: the latter occurs in 4 K. xii. 15 B (-ου A), 2 Ch. xxvii. 5 B*A, 3 M. iii. 10 and is usual in N.T.

The extension of the -ω terminations to the *present* of these verbs is slenderly attested in LXX.

From **τιθέω** we have only the part. **ἐπιτιθοῦσαν** 1 Es. iv. 30 BA: elsewhere -μι forms, -τίθημι (no ex. of 2 sg.) -τίθησι, προστίθετε 2 Es. xxiii. 18, παρατιθέασι Ep. J. 29, τιθέναι Prov. viii. 29 ℵ^c.a A, τιθείς, and throughout the middle. For present **διδόω**[1] there is some attestation in the Kethubim and Apocryphal group: διδοῖς W. xii. 19 BA (δίδως ℵ), διδοῖ Ψ xxxvi. 21 B ℵ* R (δίδωσιν ℵ^c.a AT), ἀποδιδοῖ Job xxxiv. 11 B* ℵ C (-δίδωσιν A, ἀποδοῖ B^ab), and part. διδοῦντι Prov. xxvi. 8 ℵ (διδόντι BA)[2]. Elsewhere in act. and mid. the -μι forms are retained, except that in the 3rd sing. imperf. and 2 aor. middle forms as from **δίδω** (by an easy change of ο to ε) appear in late portions or texts of the LXX: imperf. ἐδίδετο Jer. lii. 34 B* ℵ* A (the chap. is a late appendix to the Greek version), Dan. Θ Bel 32 B*AQ, Ex. v. 13 A (ἐδίδοτο AF): 2 aor. ἐξέδετο 1 M. x. 58 A ℵ* (-έδοτο ℵ^c.a V and so elsewhere: Gen. xxv. 33, Jd. iii. 8 etc.).

6. **Ἵημι**, never uncompounded in LXX, in composition with ἀπό retains in the active the -μι forms more often than not, whereas with σύν the new forms in -ω preponderate. A doubt arises as to the accentuation of these new forms[3]. We might expect, as we find with other -μι verbs, the first stage in the transformation to be the conversion into a contract verb,

[1] Διδοῖ for δίδωσι appears once in an illiterate epistle of ii/B.C. (Par. Pap. 30. 12, 162 B.C., not noted by Mayser): otherwise the Ptolemaic papyri keep the -μι forms in act. and mid., except that ἀποδιδῶσι once replaces -διδόασι (Mayser 354). The participle of the -όω type cannot be paralleled till ii/A.D., ἀναδιδοῦντι OP iii. 532. 11.

[2] Mixture of δίδως, διδούς in 3 K. xxii. 6 A, Ψ cxliv. 15 R is merely a matter of phonetic writing: cf. § 6, 34.

[3] Swete (ed. 2) is inconsistent: συνιεῖν 3 K. iii. 9, 11, συνιῶν 2 Ch. xxxiv. 12: elsewhere συνίειν -ίων etc.

i.e. that the order was *ἵημι—ἱέω* (like *τιθέω*)—*ἵω*. Evidence for the intermediate form is, however, wanting. In the Ptolemaic papyri the verb is rare and only the *-μι* forms are attested[1]. In the N.T. *-ίω* is shown to be right by the forms *ἀφίομεν*, *ἤφιεν*,

	In *-μι*		In *-ω* (?*-ῶ*)	
Pres. ind.	*ἀφίημι* 1 M. x. 29 f. 32 f. *ἀφίησι(ν)* N. xxii. 13, 1 Es. iv. 21, Sir. ii. 11 *ἀφίεμεν* 1 M. xiii. 39	—	*ἀφίω* Eccl. ii. 18 *ἀφεῖς*[2] Ex. xxxii. 32 *ἀφίουσι(ν)* 1 Es. iv. 7, 50 B* (*ἀφιῶσιν* A)	*συνίεις* Job xv. 9, xxxvi. 4, Tob. iii. 8 BA *συνίει* 1 K. xviii. 15, Prov. xxi. 12, 29, W. ix. 11
Imperf.	*ἤφιεις* Dan. Ο Sus. 53	—	—	—
Pres. inf.	*ἀφιέναι* Gen. xxxv. 18, 1 Es. iv. 7 A (*ἀφεῖναι* B), 1 M. i. 48 A (*-εῖναι* ℵV)	*συνιέναι* Ex. xxxv. 35, xxxvi. 1, Dt. xxxii. 29, Ψ xxxv. 4 (*συνεῖναι* ℵ) (lvii. 10 B^{ab}), Is. lix. 15 BQ (*συνῖναι* ℵ*A), Dan. Θ ix. 13	—	*συνίειν* 1 K. ii. 10, 3 K. iii. 9 B (*συνιέναι* A), 11, Jer. ix. 24
Pres. part.	—	*συνιείς* Ψ xxxii. 15 (*-ίων* B^{ab} U): *συνιέντ(ες)* 2 Es. xviii. 3 [contrast 2 *συνίων*], Dan. Θ i. 4, ΟΘ xi. 35, xii. 3	*ἀφίων* Eccl. v. 11 (Sir. xx. 7 A, 2 Es. xix. 17 $ℵ^{c.a}$)	*συνίων* (*-ίοντος* etc.) *passim*: 1 K. xviii. 14, 1 Ch. xxv. 7, 2 Ch. xxvi. 5, xxx. 22, xxxiv. 12, 2 Es. viii. 16 B etc. etc.

[1] Mayser 354.

[2] Contracted form of *ἀφίεις* (or *ἀφιεῖς*): Schmiedel (W.-S. § 14, 16 on the same form in Ap. ii. 20) suggests a present *ἀφέω* (evolved from *-ήσω*).

ἀφίονται. In LXX no forms occur but those which are common to -ω and -ῶ verbs[1]. We have seen more than once that N.T. usage represents a later stage than LXX usage: it remains therefore doubtful whether in LXX we should write *ἀφίω* or *ἀφιῶ* etc., but, in the absence of attestation for *ἀφιοῦμεν* etc., the forms in *-ίω* are on the whole to be preferred.

The following are common to the -ω and *-μι* forms: imperat. *ἀφιέτωσαν* 1 M. x. 33, ind. *συνίετε* Job xx. 2 B𝔎*C: the latter, in view of the table on the preceding page, is no doubt from *συνίω* and, as it cannot be referred to *συνιέω*, it favours the N.T. accentuation for LXX.

Ἀνιέναι 1 K. xii. 23 B (no A text): the MSS are divided in 4 M. iv. 10, *ἐνίοντες* AV *ἐνιε|τες* 𝔎.

In the *middle* the *-μι* forms are, as usual, retained: *προίεμαι* Prov. viii. 4, *ἀφιεμένη* 1 M. x. 31 A𝔎$^{c.a}$ (*ἀφιμένη* 𝔎*V*), *προιέμεν(ος)* 2 M. xv. 12, 4 M. xviii. 3, *ἀνίεντο* Ez. i. 25 (from Θ) A (*ἀνίοντο* Q: so *προσίοντο* 2 M. x. 34 V); to the *-μι* class should therefore be referred ambiguous forms, *προίῃ* Job vii. 19, *ἀνίεται* W. xvi. 24, *ἀφίεται* 1 M. x. 42 (*ἀφῖται* 𝔎), *ἀφιέσθω* 1 M. xv. 8 A.

Tenses. Fut. and 1 aor. act. ind. (with 2 aor. in the moods) are regular *ἀφ- συν- ήσω* etc.: *ἀν- ἀφ- καθ- συνῆκα, παρῆκαν* 1 K. ii. 5: *ἀνῇ ἀνείς ἀνές* etc. Perf. act. *-εἶκα* is absent from LXX as from N.T.: perf. pass. (*ἀνεῖμαι παρεῖμαι*: never, as in N.T., *-έωμαι*) is common in the part. Fut. mid. and pass. *προήσομαι, ἀφεθήσομαι*. For augment in 1 aor. pass. see § 16, 5.

7. **Remaining moods and tenses of ἵστημι, τίθημι, δίδωμι. Ἵστημι. Perfect.** The *κοινή* gave up the **shorter forms** of the ind. plur. (*ἔσταμεν, ἔστατε, ἑστᾶσιν*) which already in iv/B.C. had made way for *ἑστήκαμεν* etc. in Attic Inscriptions[2]. In the inf. however it retained the shorter *ἑστάναι*: in the participle *ἑστηκώς* was almost universal in Ptolemaic Egypt[3], but, judging from the N.T.[4] and contemporary and later writings, there appears to have been a reversion to the classical

[1] Except the puzzling CYNIEITE in Jer. ix. 12 A (*συνέτω* of B𝔎Q is probably right).

[2] Meisterhans 189 f.

[3] Mayser 370 f., except that *ἑνεστώς* was used along with *ἑνεστηκώς*.

[4] *Ἑστώς* is about three times as common as *ἑστηκώς* in N.T. (W.-S. § 14, 5) and in Josephus (W. Schmidt 481 f.) and is usual in Patristic writings (Reinhold 91).

ἑστώς a little before the beginning of the Christian era. This (?) Atticistic reversion is apparent in later LXX books.

In the *ind.* the only ex. of the shorter form is καθεστᾶσιν 4 M. i. 18 A V (literary: -ήκασιν ℵ): elsewhere always -εστήκασιν (-έστηκαν Is. v. 29, § 17, 3). *Inf.*: ἑστάναι always, with καθεστάναι 4 M. v. 25 ℵ (-ιστ. A), xv. 4: but in comp. with παρά we find παρεστηκέναι Dt. xxi. 5, Est. viii. 4 beside παρεστάναι Dt. x. 8, xviii. 5. *Part.*: ἑστηκώς and ἑστώς (compounds included) occur in about the proportion of 95/51; the former is used throughout the Hexateuch (except ἑστῶτα Ex. xxxiii. 10 BAF) as in the contemporary papyri: ἑστώς is practically[1] confined to late and literary books, viz. Jd. B text (iii. 19 ἐφ-, iv. 21 ἐξ-, xviii. 16, 18: but παρεστηκώς xx. 28 BA), Ruth, 2–4 K. (beside ἑστηκώς), 2 Es. (xxii. 44), Ψ (cxxi. 2, cxxxiii. 1, cxxxiv. 2), Dan. ΟΘ together with the literary books 1 Es., Est., Jdth, 2 and 3 Macc.

The similar shortened forms from **τέθνηκα** are confined to literary books (elsewhere τεθνήκασιν etc.): τεθνέασιν 4 M. xii. 4 ℵ (for correct Attic τεθνᾶσι), τεθνάναι W. iii. 2, 4 M. iv. 22 (1 M. iv. 35 V), τεθνεῶτες Job xxxix. 30 (Bar. ii. 17 A).

The new **transitive perfect** **ἕστακα**[2], in which the α seems to be taken over from the passive ἕσταμαι, appears in three LXX books: 1 K. (ἀνέστακεν xv. 12), Jer. α (κατέστακα i. 10 BℵA, vi. 17 Bℵ*A, ἀφέστακα xvi. 5 BQ with v.l. ἀφέστηκα ℵA) and 1 Macc. (καθεστάκαμεν x. 20, ἑστάκαμεν xi. 34 -ιμεν ℵ).

Ἕστηκα is used in present sense "I stand": for the new present στήκω which is beginning to replace it see § 19, 1. For plpf. (ε)ἱστήκειν, ἑστήκειν see § 16, 5.

8. The 2nd **aorist** active **ἔστην** (with compounds) and the 1 aor. pass. **ἐστάθην** (the latter rare outside Gen., Ex. and literary books) are correctly distinguished, the former intransitive "I stood" and the latter passive "was set up." The

[1] The following sporadic exx. of ἑστώς complete the list: 1 K. ii. 22 A (elsewhere in this book always ἑστηκώς), 1 Ch. xxi. 15, Jer. xviii. 21 A, Ez. xxii. 30, Am. ix. 1 (ἐφ-), Zech. i. 11 (ἐφ-), iii. 1, Sir. l. 12 Bℵ (ἑστηκώς A).

[2] So in papyri, inscriptions and literature from ii/B.C. onwards: Mayser 371, Veitch s.v. ἵστημι, Schweizer *Perg.* 185. An instance as early as iv/B.C. is cited from Hyperides *Eux.* 38.

same applies to *στήσομαι, σταθήσομαι* (with compounds). The only exception[1] in the use of the aorist is Jd. xx. 2 B *ἐστάθησαν κατὰ πρόσωπον Κυρίου πᾶσαι αἱ φύλαι* (A otherwise with *ἔστη*): similarly *στήσομαι* appears to be used for fut. pass. in Is. xxiii. 16 *καὶ (Τύρος) πάλιν ἀποκαταστήσεται εἰς τὸ ἀρχαῖον* BA (*-σταθήσεται* ℵQΓ).

The two futures occur in juxtaposition or as variants in L. xxvii. 12 *οὕτως στήσεται* with 14 *οὕτως σταθήσεται*, Dt. xix. 15 *στήσεται πᾶν ῥῆμα* B (*σταθήσεται* AF), but they keep their proper meanings.

In N.T., on the other hand, *ἔστην ἐστάθην* with *στήσομαι σταθήσ.* (in the simple verb) are both used intransitively (Blass N.T. § 23, 6).

The 2 aor. **imperat.** 2 sg. appears both as **ἀνάστηθι** (45 exx.) and **ἀνάστᾱ** (poetical: 18 exx.).

The latter mainly in later books viz. Jd. (v. 12 B, viii. 21 BA, xix. 28 B), 1 K. (ix. 26, xvi. 12), 3 K. (xix. 7 B, xx. 15), 2 Es. (x. 4 Bℵ*), Psalms (iii. 8, xliii. 27, lxxiii. 22, lxxxi. 8), in all of which, except 2 Es., *-στηθι* is used as well: the remaining exx. of *-στα* are Jer. ii. 27, Lam. ii. 19 (*-στηθι* Q), Jon. i. 6, Dan. Ο vii. 5, Cant. ii. 10, 13, Sir. xxxiv. 21. *Ἀπόστηθι* (2 K. ii. 22, 1 Es. i. 25, Sir. vii. 2) and *ἀπόστα* (Gen. xix. 9 ADE, Job *ἴσθι*) are equally divided: other compounds have the classical prose form only (*ἀποκατάστηθι* Jer. xxix. 6, *ἐπίστηθι* Jer. xxvi. 14, *παράστηθι* N. xxiii. 3, 15).

The 2 aor. imperat. of *βαίνω* appears only in the forms *ἀνά-* (*κατά-* etc.) *-βηθι -βήτω -βητε* (not *ἀνάβα -βάτω -βάτε* which occur in N.T.).

9. **Confusion of ἔστησα and ἔστην** (arising from the 3rd plur. which they have in common) occurs in 2 Es. xviii. 4 *καὶ ἔστησεν* (ℵ*: *ἔστη* BA) *Ἔσρας ὁ γραμμ. ἐπὶ βήματος ξυλίνου, καὶ ἔστησεν* (Bℵ*A) *ἐχόμενα αὐτοῦ Ματταθίας κ.τ.λ.* (Lucian *ἔστη...καὶ ἔστησαν σὺν αὐτῷ*), and apparently in 1 Es. ii. 7 B

[1] In Dan. ΟΘ vii. 4 f. *ἐπὶ ποδῶν ἀνθρώπου ἐστάθη κ.τ.λ.* the adjacent passive aorists show that the beast is regarded as a mere passive instrument. In Tob. vii. 11 (B text) *οὐ γεύομαι οὐδὲν ὧδε ἕως ἂν στήσητε καὶ σταθῆτε πρὸς μέ* the meaning seems to be "make covenant with me and have your covenant ratified by me": the language has a legal preciseness.

καὶ καταστήσαντες οἱ ἀρχίφυλοι...(A καταστάντες : = 2 Es. i. 5 ἀνέστησαν, יקומו : in 1 Es. v. 47 correctly καταστὰς Ἰησοῦς).

Cf. further Jd. vii. 21 καὶ ἔστησεν ἀνὴρ ἐφ' ἑαυτῷ B*vid (MT has plur. vb and it may be a mere slip for ἔστησαν) : Ψ xx. 12 βουλὴν ἣν οὐ μὴ δύνωνται στῆναι ℵc.aAR (στῆσαι B ℵ*) : Sir. xlv. 23 Φινεὲς...τρίτος εἰς δόξαν ἐν τῷ ζηλῶσαι αὐτὸν...καὶ στῆσαι (στῆναι A) αὐτὸν (Swete αὐτὸν) ἐν τροπῇ λαοῦ B ℵ.

Similar confusion of act. and mid. occurs in Jdth viii. 12 τίνες ἐστὲ ὑμεῖς οἳ...ἵστατε ὑπὲρ τοῦ θεοῦ; B (ἵσταται) ℵ*A (ἵστασθε ℵc.a), R.V. "stand instead of God."

10. **Τίθημι, δίδωμι. Perfect.** Τίθημι has perf. act. τέθεικα (not τέθηκα as in Attic Inscriptions) and perf. mid. τέθειμαι (Ex. xxxiv. 27, 2 M. iv. 15), also used in pass. sense (τέθειται 1 K. ix. 24 B [A τέθεσται like τετέλεσται], προτεθειμένων Ex. xxix. 23, προσ- Dt. xxiii. 15, 1 Es. ii. 6, Est. ix. 27, 1 M. viii. 1 A) where classical Greek used κεῖμαι : κεῖμαι has this idiomatic use in 2 Macc. and occasionally elsewhere.

Aorist. The 1st aorist forms in -κα which were used in the sing. in Attic (ἔθηκα, ἔδωκα) have in LXX been extended to the plural (for Attic 2nd aor. ἔθεμεν, ἔδομεν etc.) : ἐθήκαμεν Is. xxviii. 15, 2 Es. xv. 10, 2 M. i. 8 προεθ-, ἔθηκαν and ἔδωκαν *passim* ; ἔθεσαν (προ- ἐπ-) appears twice in literary language, 2 M. xiv. 21, 4 M. viii. 13, also as a v.l. for -έθηκαν in 1 K. vi. 18 A, 3 K. xxi. 32 B. The 2nd aor. forms are retained in the moods and in the middle voice.

The introduction of sigmatic aorists ἔθησα, ἔδωσα did not take place till after the period covered by LXX and N.T. ; Cod. A supplies an early example of each : θῆσαι 1 M. xiv. 48 (στῆσαι ℵV), ἔδωσεν Sir. xv. 20 (ἔδωκεν BℵC) : cf. the perf. δέδωσαν in the clause added after 2 Es. xvii. 71 by the seventh century hand ℵc.a.

Moods of the 2nd aorist of δίδωμι. In LXX the *conjunctive* forms are regular (δῶ, δῷς, δῷ etc.) with two exceptions : (i) the 3rd sing. twice appears in the strange form δῇ (another case of assimilation to -ω verbs) L. xxiv. 19 BA (δῷ F), xxvii. 9

BA (δῷ F), (ii) -δῷς -δῷ are replaced in a few instances by -δοῖς -δοῖ, viz.:

ὡς ἂν παραδοῖ Jos. ii. 14 BF (παραδῷ A), ἀνταποδοῖ 2 K. iii. 39 A (ἀποδῷ B), μὴ παραδοῖ Ψ xl. 3 B (-δώῃ ℵAR, -δῷ T), ἕως ἀνταποδοῖ Sir. xxxii. 24 ℵ* (-δῷ BAC$^{c.a}$), ἀποδοῖ Ez. xxxiii. 15 BA (ἀποδῷ Q), μὴ δὴ παραδοῖς Dan. Θ iii. 34 B (-δῷς AQ), ὅπως παραδοῖ 1 M. xi. 40 A (-δῷ V).

The *optative* δοίην -ης etc. is replaced, as in the κοινή generally, by [δῴην, no ex. of 1st sing.] δῴης (Ψ lxxxiv. 8), δῴη *passim*. The classical forms are represented by two v.ll. δοίη in Sir. xlv. 26 ℵ*A, Job vi. 8 ℵ$^{c.a}$.

Cf. the moods of ἔγνων, § 24. For δῶναι=δοῦναι see § 6, 34.

11. **Εἰμί**. The transformation of this verb, complete in modern Greek, started from the fut. ἔσομαι: to conform to this the remaining tenses have gradually passed over to the deponent class[1]. The change began with the imperfect and with the 1st person sing., for which a new form was required in order to distinguish it from the 3rd person. Hence ἤμην, which is employed throughout the LXX, as in the Ptolemaic papyri[2], to the exclusion of class ἦν (or ἦ).

The transformation in LXX times has hardly proceeded further. The 2nd sing. is generally ἦσθα (17 times); ἦς (which is normal in N.T. and later became ἦσο) is limited to Jd. xi. 35 B, R. iii. 2 (both late translations), Ob. i. 11: it occurs also as a v.l. in Is. xxxvii. 10 ℵ*, Job xxii. 3 A, xxxviii. 4 BℵC (ἦσθα A: possibly the clause is from Θ).

3rd sing. ἦν for which ἦ is a natural slip in 2 Ch. xxi. 20 A*, 2 Es. xvi. 18 B*, Tob. i. 22 ℵ*. (I cannot verify 3 K. xii. 24 quoted in Hatch-Redpath.)

The 1st plur. soon followed the lead of the 1st sing. but in LXX ἤμεθα[3] is limited to Bar. i. 19, 1 K. xxv. 16 BA: in the preceding *v.* in 1 K. BA have the classical ἦμεν, which is also used elsewhere: N. xiii. 34 *bis*, Dt. vi. 21, Is. xx. 6. 2nd and 3rd plur. regular.

[1] See esp. Dieterich *Untersuch.* 223 ff.
[2] Mayser 356.
[3] One ex. of iii/B.C. in the papyri (ib.).

In the *present*, uniformity in the first syllable has been produced in modern Greek by replacing ἐσ- throughout by εἰ-. The only approximation to this in LXX is the vulgar ἤτω (3rd pers. imperat.[1]) in Ψ ciii. 31 (all uncials) and as a v.l. of Cod. A in 1 M. x. 31, xvi. 3: elsewhere ἔστω, including Ψ lxviii. 26, lxxi. 17, lxxxix. 17. 3rd plur. imperat. ἔστωσαν (classical beside ἔστων, ὄντων). 3rd plur. optat. εἴησαν Job xxvii. 7 (class. beside εἶεν: cf. § 17, 7). For ἔσῃ, ἔσει see § 17, 12.

Ἔνι (=ἔνεστι), which in mod. Greek in the form εἶνε (εἶναι) has replaced ἐστί and εἰσί, stands for the former, as in N.T., already in Sir. xxxvii. 2 οὐχὶ λύπη ἔνι ἕως θανάτου ἑταῖρος καὶ φίλος τρεπόμενος εἰς ἔχθραν; R.V. "Is there not a grief in it...?" probably lays undue stress on the preposition. (In 4 M. iv. 22 ὡς ἔνι μάλιστα="as much as possible.")

12. **Εἶμι** in the LXX period had well-nigh disappeared from popular speech, being replaced by the hitherto unused tenses and moods of ἔρχομαι: the participle and the inf. of a few compounds seem to have been the last to go[2]. Literary writers still made use of it, though not always correctly, missing its future meaning: its revival in Patristic writings is rather remarkable[3].

In LXX εἶμι (always in composition except in Ex. xxxii. 26)[4] is confined to (i) the literary books Wisdom, 2—4 Maccabees, Proverbs, (ii) the latter part of Exodus, with two instances elsewhere of ἐπιών of time.

(i) The Greek books alone use the imperf. viz. περιήειν W. viii. 18, ἀπήει 2 M. xii. 1, xiii. 22, 4 M. iv. 8, εἰσήει 2 M. iii. 14, διεξῄεσαν 4 M. iii. 13: the inf. εἰσιέναι occurs in 3 M. i. 11, ii. 28, the part. ἐξιόντ(ες) ib. v. 5, 48, ἀνιόντος 4 M. iv. 10, προσιόντ(ες) ib. vi. 13, xiv. 16, 19 δύς, (οἱ) παριόντ(ες) Prov. ix. 15, xv. 10, and (of time) ἡ ἐπιοῦσα (sc. ἡμέρα) Prov. iii. 28=xxvii. 1="the morrow."

(ii) The latter part of Exodus (as distinguished from the earlier part, which uses ἀπ- εἰς- ἐξ- ἔρχεσθαι) has εἰσιόντι xxviii. 23, εἰσιόντι...καὶ ἐξιόντι xxviii. 31, ἴτω xxxii. 26, ἀπιόντος xxxiii. 8, 10 A.

[1] It may be due to Phrygian influence, Dr Moulton tells me. Symmachus in ii/A.D. has ἔσο for ἴσθι. Cf. ἔσσο in Sappho: the middle forms of εἰμί occur very early in the dialects, J. H. Moulton *Prol.* 36 f.

[2] See the scanty papyrus evidence for iii/ii/B.C. in Mayser 355.

[3] Reinhold 87 ff.

[4] Ἴσθι πρὸς τὸν μύρμηκα must be read in Prov. vi. 6 with B*ℵA[1], not ἴθι A*B[ab].

Elsewhere (of future time) *εἰς τὸν ἐπιόντα χρόνον* Dt. xxxii. 29, *ἐν τῷ ἐπιόντι ἔτει* 1 Ch. xx. 1. A introduces the literary word with correct future meaning in 3 K. xxi. 22 *ἄνεισιν* (B *ἀναβαίνει* is no doubt the older reading).

13. **Κάθημαι** has the regular 2 sing. *κάθησαι* (not *κάθῃ*), but the imperat. is usually *κάθου* (early comedy and late prose: the pres. meaning causing transition to the pres. conjugation), the strict Attic *κάθησο* appearing only in 2 Ch. xxv. 19: the unclassical fut. *καθήσομαι* is fairly common (cf. § 24).

Κεῖμαι is regular. For the conjugation of *οἶδα* (with 1st aor. *εἴδησα*) see § 24.

§ 24. Table of Noteworthy Verbs.

Ἀγαλλιάομαι (the act. found in N.T., not in LXX), a "Biblical" word, frequent in Is. and Ψ, replacing classical *ἀγάλλομαι*. Impf. *ἠγαλλιώμην* Is. xxv. 9, fut. *ἀγαλλιάσομαι*, aor. *ἠγαλλιασάμην* (not, as in N.T., *-ά(σ)θην*), § 21, 6.

Ἀγγέλλω: aor. and fut. pass. *ἠγγέλην* (*ἀν- ἀπ-*: for Attic *ἠγγέλθην*) *ἀγγελήσομαι* (*ἀν- ἀπ- δι-*), § 21, 4.

Ἄγνυμι only in composition with *κατ-*, as usually in Attic (in 4 M. ix. 17 read *ἄγξαι* with ℵ for *ἆξαι* A): pres. and impf. unattested: aor. with Att. augment *κατέαξα* and pass. *κατεάχθην* for Att. 2nd aor. *κατέαγην*, § 16, 6: fut. *κατάξω* (not with aug. *κατεάξω* as in N.T.).

Ἀγοράζω: fut. *ἀγορῶ* (Att. *ἀγοράσω*), § 20, 1 (ii).

Ἄγω[1]: aor. usually *ἤγαγον* (with varying terminations *ἠγάγοσαν*, § 17, 5, *ἐπήγαγα*, § 17, 2: cf. impf. *ἦγαν*, § 17, 4), rarely *συν-(ἐπ- ἀν-)ήξα* § 21, 1: perf. act. *ἀγ(ε)ίοχα*, *ἀγήοχα* (for Att. *ἦχα*), § 16, 7: perf. pass. *ἦγμαι* regular.

Ἄδω (Att. contraction, not the poetical *ἀείδω*): fut. *ᾄσομαι* (Att.) and *ᾄσω*, § 20, 3.

Αἰδέομαι: aor. *ᾐδέσθην* and once *ᾐδεσάμην*, § 21, 6.

Αἰνέω (**ἐπαινέω**): fut. pass. (in Ψ with middle sense "will boast" or "glory") *ἐπαινεσθήσομαι* (for Att. *ἐπαινεθ.*), aor. pass. *ἐπηνέθην* with v.l. *-έσθην*, § 18, 2.

Αἱρετίζω Ionic and late for *αἱροῦμαι* "choose," the latter being rare in LXX: fut. *αἱρετιῶ* and as v.l. *αἱρετίσω*, § 20, 1 (i): aor. *ᾑρέτισα* and (in Ψ, 1 M.) *ᾑρετισάμην*.

[1] A beginning of the 'Neohellenic' substitution of *φέρω* for *ἄγω* (Jannaris § 996. 3) may be traced in some late texts, e.g. Jd. (B text) xviii. 3 *Τίς ἤνεγκέν σε ὧδε;* (A *ἤγαγεν*), xxi. 12 (A *ἦγον*).

Αἱρέω mainly in composition: new fut. ἑλῶ, ἑλοῦμαι (ἀν- ἀφ- etc.) for Att. αἱρήσω which is dropped, § 20, 2: new aor. terminations εἷλα εἵλάμην (ἀν- etc.), § 17, 2, καθείλοσαν, § 17, 5: augment in perf. -εἵρημαι (for -ἤρημαι) but imperf. -ἤρουν, -ηρούμην (like εἴργασμαι, ἠργαζόμην), § 16, 5: augment omitted in ἀντ-αναιρέθην, § 16, 4.

Αἴρω: new verbal adj. ἀρτός, § 15, 2.

Αἰσθάνομαι: new aor. pass. ἠσθήθην (beside Att. ἠσθόμην) and new fut. pass. αἰσθηθήσομαι and αἰσθανθήσομαι (for Att. αἰσθήσομαι), § 21, 6. The late pres. αἴσθομαι occurs in one of the explanatory notes which Cod. ℵ appends to the Song of Solomon, ἡ νύμφη ἔσθετε (=αἴσθεται) τὸν νύμφιον v. 2.

Αἰσχύνομαι: fut. αἰσχυνθήσομαι (for usual Attic αἰσχυνοῦμαι), § 21, 7: perf. ἤσχυμμαι (κατ-), § 18, 4: aug. omitted in καταισχύνθην, § 16, 4.

Ἀκατασταστέω: 1 aor. ἠκαταστάτησα, § 16, 8.

Ἀκούω: fut. ἀκούσομαι (Att.) and rarely ἀκούσω, § 20, 3; perf. pass. (post-classical) ἤκουσμαι Dt. iv. 32 BF, 3 K. vi. 12 A, cf. § 18, 2.

Ἀλαλάζω poetical word used in prose from Xen. onwards: fut. ἀλαλάξομαι and -άξω, § 20, 3: aor. ἠλάλαξα.

Ἀλείφω: perf. ἤλιφα (Cod. A), ἤλιμμαι, for Att. reduplicated forms ἀλήλιφα, ἀλήλιμμαι, § 16, 7.

Ἀλήθω Jd. xvi. 21, Eccl. xii. 3 f. with impf. ἤληθον N. xi. 8 in the κοινή replaces Attic ἀλέω ἤλουν: the old aor. ἤλεσα remains in Is. xlvii. 2. Cf. similar substitution of mute for Att. contract verb in νήθω (LXX=Att. νέω), and outside LXX κνήθω, σμήχω, ψήχω: Rutherford *NP* 240.

Ἁλίσκομαι: perf. 3rd plur. ἑάλωκαν ℵ, § 17, 3: 1 aor. pass. (late in *simplex*) ἁλωθῆναι Ez. xl. 1 A (ἁλῶναι cett., and Att. 2nd aor. ἑάλων is retained elsewhere in LXX).

Ἅλλομαι (ἀφ- ἐν- ἐξ- ἐφ- ὑπερ-: a favourite word in 1 K. and Minor Proph.): aor. always ἡλάμην (not the alternative Att. ἡλόμην), itacism produces the readings ἀφειλαντο Ez. xliv. 10 A, ἐνειλατο 1 M. iii. 23 V: impf. ἡλλόμην (aug. ἐλλόμην once in A, § 16, 4) and fut. ἁλοῦμαι are classical.

Ἁμαρτάνω: fut. ἁμαρτήσομαι and (in Sir.) ἁμαρτήσω, § 20, 3: aor. usually ἥμαρτον (3rd plur. ἡμάρτοσαν, § 17, 5), rarely ἡμάρτησα, § 21, 1. For the trans. (causative) use of ἐξ-(ἐφ-)αμαρτάνειν "cause to sin" see Syntax.

(**Ἀμφιάζω**) found only in aor. ἠμφίασα, ἠμφιασάμην and ἠμφιεσάμην, §§ 23, 2 and 6, 6.

Ἀνᾰλίσκω is the usual pres. in LXX as in Att., ἀνᾰλόω (also Att.) only in καταναλοῦσιν Ep. J. 9 BF with impf. ἀνήλουν Dan. Θ Bel 13 (ἀνήλεισκον Q*). As regards augment (Attic writers seem to have used both ἀνήλωσα and ἀνάλωσα etc., Veitch) the

LXX uncials write *ἀνήλωσα* (*ἐξ-*), *ἀνηλώθην* (*ἐξ-*), *ἀνήλωμαι* (*ἐξ-παρ-*), but with the prefix *κατ-* the aug. disappears: *κατανάλισκον* Jer. xxvii. 7 B*Q*A, *κατανάλωσα* 1 Ch. xxi. 26, Jer. iii. 24 (*κατηνάλωσεν* ℵ*), *καταναλώθην* Is. lix. 14 (*κατηναλ.* B^{ab}): so *ἐξαναλώθη* N. xxxii. 13 A. The uncial evidence is, however, shown to be unreliable by the fact that the aug. is not written in the moods and the other tenses and derivative nouns, as it is almost without exception in the Ptolemaic papyri (*ἀνηλίσκειν*, *ἀνηλώσω*, (*ἐπ*)*ανήλωμα* etc., Mayser 345 f.): cf. § 16, 9.

Ἀνοίγω: see *οἴγω*.

Ἀνομέω: impf. 3rd plur. *ἠνομοῦσαν*, § 17, 5: aug. *παρηνόμουν* (as from *παρ-ανομέω*) Ψ cxviii. 51 RT (*παρεν.* A), § 16, 8.

(**Ἀντάω**): fut. *ἀπ-συν-ὑπ-αντήσομαι* and *-αντήσω*, § 20, 3.

Ἀπειλοῦμαι deponent as in N.T. etc. (for Att. *ἀπειλῶ*, which is usual in LXX) is a variant in Gen. xxvii. 42 E, Ez. iii. 17 Q (*ἀπειληθῆναι* N. xxiii. 19 must have pass. meaning, cf. the citation in Jdth viii. 16): the dep. *διαπειλεῖσθαι* Ez. iii. 17 BA, 3 M. vi. 23, vii. 6 is classical.

Ἀπολογοῦμαι: aor. *ἀπελογησάμην* (not *-ήθην*), § 21, 6.

Ἅπτω: pf. pass. *ἧμμαι* is used in mid. sense "touch" (class.), N. xix. 18, Jd. xx. 41 A, 1 K. vi. 9, so *ἄνοια ἐξῆπται καρδίας νέου* Prov. xxii. 15 B*C (doubtless right, though the Heb. "is bound up in" lends some support to the other reading *καρδίᾳ*): fut. pass. *ἁφθήσομαι* (*ἀν-*) Jer. xxxi. 9, Sir. iii. 15 ℵ* lacks early authority.

Ἀράομαι: the *simplex* (poet.) in the Balaam story, rarely elsewhere, usually in composition with *κατ-* (class.) or the stronger (unclass.) *ἐπικατ-*: fut. and aor. regular *-αράσομαι*, (*κατ*)*ηρασάμην*, the Ionic *κατηρησάμην* once in A, § 22, 2, the aug. in first syllable in *ἐκαταρασάμην* 2 Es. xxiii. 25 B, dropped in *ἐπικαταράσατο* Ψ cli. 6 R, doubled in *ἐπεκατηράσατο* ib. T: aor. pass. (unclass.) with pass. sense *καταραθείη* Job iii. 5, xxiv. 18: perf. pass. with pass. sense "accursed" *κατήραμαι* and with aug. and redupl. (unclass.) *κεκατήραμαι*, § 16, 8.

Ἀργέω: neut. part. *ἀργῶν* = *ἀργοῦν*, § 22, 1.

Ἀρνέομαι: aor. *ἠρνησάμην* (for usual Att. *-ήθην*), § 21, 6.

Ἁρπάζω: unclass. asigmatic fut. (*δι*)*αρπῶμαι*, § 20, 1 (ii), beside Att. tenses *ἁρπάσω*, *ἥρπασα*, *ἡρπάσθην*, *ἥρπασμαι*: new guttural pass. forms *ἡρπάγην*, *διαρπαγήσομαι*, §§ 18, 3 (iii), 21, 4.

(**Ἀσπίζω**): fut. *συν-ὑπερ-ασπιῶ* with v.l. *-ασπίσω*, § 20, 1 (i).

Αὐγέω "shine" is unattested elsewhere: *ηὔγει* Job xxix. 3.

Αὐλίζομαι: aug. in Cod. A *εὐλίζετο*, § 16, 4.

Αὐξάνω and **αὔξω** are both classical, in LXX the latter is limited to Is. lxi. 11, 4 M. xiii. 22 and to compounds in literary books (*ἐπαύξω*, *συναύξω*) 2 M. iv. 4, 3 M. ii. 25, 4 M. xiii. 27 AℵV (*-αυξανόντων* V): the verb retains its class. transitive meaning, "grow" "increase" being expressed by *αὐξάνομαι*, and the intrans.

use, common in N.T., being limited to *ηὔξησαν* 1 Ch. xxiii. 17 A* (*ηὐξήθησαν* cett.): the Attic fut. *αὐξήσω* in 1 Ch. xvii. 10, while the Pentateuch uses the novel *αὐξανῶ*, Gen. xvii. 6, 20, xlviii. 4, L. xxvi. 9: the fut. pass. *αὐξηθήσομαι* is regular, N. xxiv. 7, Jer. xxiii. 3.

Αὐταρκέω, αὐτομολέω: aug. omitted in *αὐτάρκησα, αὐτομόλησα*, § 16, 4.

Ἀφανίζω: fut. *ἀφανιῶ* and *-ίσω*, § 20, 1 (i).

Ἀχρειόω: 3rd plur. perf. *ἠχρείωκαν*, § 17, 3.

Βαδίζω: fut. *βαδιοῦμαι* (Att.) and, once in ℵ, the later *βαδιῶ*, § 20, 3.

Βαίνω rare in the *simplex* (Dt. xxviii. 56 and three times in literary books in perf. and pluperf.): new present *-βέννω* (cf. *-βένω*), § 19, 2: perf. part. *βεβηκώς*, not the alternative Att. *βεβώς*: aug. omitted in plpf. *βεβήκειν*, § 16, 2: aug. *vice* reduplication in *κατέβηκα* Cod. A, § 16, 7: 3rd plur. impf. *-έβαιναν*, § 17, 4: 2nd aor. imperat. *ἀνά-(κατά-* etc.)*βηθι -βήτω -βητε*, not the N.T. forms *ἀνάβα-βάτω-βατε*, § 23, 8: 2nd aor. opt. *καταβοῖ* (for *-βαίη*) 2 K. i. 21 B (*καταβήτω* A, *καταβῇ* Swete).

Βάλλω: aug. omitted in plpf. *-βεβλήκειν*, § 16, 2, duplicated in double compound *παρεσυνεβλήθην*, § 16, 8: aor. terminations *ἐβάλοσαν*, § 17, 5 and *ἔβαλαν -ας* (Hb. iii. 13 A^{corr}), § 17, 2.

Βαρέω only in the old perf. part. pass. *βεβαρημένος* 2 M. xiii. 9 A (*βεβαρωμένος* V, § 22, 4) and once in perf. ind. pass. *βεβάρηται* Ex. vii. 14 BA (*βεβάρυνται* F). Elsewhere in LXX, as in class. Greek, the verb is always **βαρύνω** (*κατα-*), whereas later the contract verb became universal (mod. Greek *βαρειοῦμαι*) and in N.T. *βαρεῖν* (with compounds *ἐπι- κατα-*) occurs 10 times as against one ex. only in WH of *-βαρύνειν* Mc. xiv. 40. *Βεβαρυμμένοι* in a papyrus of ii/B.C., no Ptolemaic ex. of *βαρεῖν*, Mayser 390.

Βαστάζω: *βαστάσω* and *ἐβάστασα* as in Attic, also *ἐβάσταξα*, § 18, 3 (iii), with which cf. the late fut. pass. *συνβασταχθήσεται* Job Θ xxviii. 16, 19.

Βιάζομαι: fut. *παραβιῶμαι* (for Att. *-βιάσομαι*, but see Veitch), § 20, 1 (ii).

Βιβάζω: fut. as in Attic *-βιβῶ* (*ἀνα- ἐπι- κατα- συμ-*: mainly in Ez. *a* and Minor Prophets), elsewhere *-βιβάσω* (Xenophon), § 20, 1 (ii): aor. pass. *ἐβιβάσθην* (Aristot.): fut. pass. late *ἀναβιβασθήσομαι* L. ii. 12.

Βιβρώσκω: see *ἐσθίω*.

Βιόω (*δια-*) rare and except Ex. xxi. 21, Sir. xl. 28, only in literary books: fut. *βιώσω* for Att. *βιώσομαι*, § 20, 3: aor. *ἐβίωσα* for the usual Att. *ἐβίων*, § 21, 1.

Βλαστάνω has alternative present forms *βλαστάω, βλαστέω*, § 19, 3 and new 1 aor. *ἐβλάστησα* with causative meaning (not Att. *ἔβλαστον*), § 21, 1: perf. *βεβλάστηκα*, § 16, 7.

Βλέπω is used not only in its original sense of the function of the eye "to look," but also, especially in later books, =*ὁρᾶν* "to see," e.g. Jd. ix. 36 B (=*ὁρᾷς* A), 4 K. ii. 19, ix. 17: *ἀναβλέπειν* besides its class. meanings "look up" and "recover sight" (Tob. xi. 8 ℵ) is used causatively in *ἀναβλέψατε εἰς ὕψος τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν* Is. xl. 26 (for the usual *τοῖς ὀφθ.*), cf. Tob. iii. 12 ℵ. Fut. *βλέψομαι* (Att.) and, more rarely, *βλέψω* (*ἐπι-*), § 20, 3. Of passive and mid. forms (unclassical except fut. mid.) LXX has impf. pass. (*ἐν*)*εβλέποντο* 3 K. viii. 8=2 Ch. v. 9 *bis*, and part. pass. *βλεπόμενος* W. ii. 14, xiii. 7, xvii. 6, Ez. xvii. 5 (*ἐπι-*): the mid. is constant in *περιεβλεψάμην* Ex. ii. 12 etc., *ὑποβλεπόμενος* "suspicious of" 1 K. xviii. 9, Sir. xxxvii. 10.

Βοάω: fut. *βοήσομαι* (Att.) and *βοήσω*, § 20, 3: as from *βοέω καταβοούντων* Cod. A, § 22, 1.

Βοηθέω: unclassical passive forms are introduced, *βεβοήθηται* Prov. xxviii. 18 has class. authority, but the 1st aor. pass. and fut. pass. are new, the uncials exhibiting a natural confusion with the tenses of *βοᾶν*: aor. *ἐβοηθήθην* 2 Ch. xxvi. 15 (the Heb. shows that *βοηθῆναι* of A is wrong), Ψ xxvii. 7, Is. x. 3, xxx. 2 (*βοηθῆναι* ℵ*), fut. *βοηθηθήσομαι* Is. xliv. 2, Dan. Θ xi. 34 (*βοηθήσονται* Q*).

Βούλομαι: 2 sing. *βούλει* B and *βούλῃ* A, § 17, 12: aug. *ἐβουλήθην*, but impf. *ἐβουλόμην* and *ἠβουλόμην*, § 16, 3.

The pres. of **βράσσω** "shake" appears in *ἀναβράσσοντος* Na. iii. 2 (Att. *βράττω*: *-βράζω* also occurs): the tenses lack classical authority, *ἀνέβρασα* Ez. xxi. 21, W. x. 19, *ἐξέβρασα* 2 Es. xxiii. 28, 2 M. i. 12, *ἐξεβράσθην* 2 M. v. 8.

Βρέχω (class. "wet" or "drench") in LXX usually means "send rain" (hail etc.), being used either absolutely, Gen. ii. 5, or with acc. *ὑετόν*, *χάλαζαν* etc., thus supplanting the class. **ὗειν** which is limited to Ex. ix. 18, xvi. 4 (cf. the new **ὑετίζειν** Jer. xiv. 22, Job Θ xxxviii. 26): fut. act. and pass. are unclassical, *βρέξω* Am. iv. 7, Jl. ii. 23, Ez. xxxviii. 22, Ψ vi. 7, *βραχήσομαι* Am. iv. 7, Is. xxxiv. 3.

Γαμέω is limited to three instances in the Greek books[1] where it is used correctly of the husband: aor. *ἔγημα* (Att.) and *ἐγάμησα* (Hell.), § 21, 2. Verbal adj. *γαμετή*="wife" 4 M. ii. 11.

Γελάω: fut. *γελάσομαι* and *γελάσω*, § 20, 3.

Γηράσκω: fut. *γηράσω* (not *-σομαι*), § 20, 3.

Γίνομαι (*γείν.* § 6, 24) not *γίγν.* except as a rare v.l., mainly in the A text of the Esdras books, § 7, 32: for aor., *ἐγενόμην*

[1] The translations, partly under the influence of the Heb., use other expressions: of the husband *γαμβρεύειν* (Gen. xxxviii. 8), *λαμβάνειν* and in 2 Es. (x. 2 etc.) the Hebraic *καθίζειν γυναῖκα* (=hiphil of יָשַׁב, "give a dwelling" or "settlement to"): of the wife *γίνεσθαί* or *εἶναί τινι* (=הָיְתָה לְ), *ἔχειν ἄνδρα*: of both *συνοικεῖν*, *συνοικίζεσθαί τινι*.

(*ἐγενάμην* in Jer. A text, § 17, 2) and *ἐγενήθην* (dialectic and late) are used interchangeably, § 21, 6: both forms of Att. perf. *γέγονα* and *γεγένημαι* (*-ένν.* Jos. v. 7 B, Ψ lxxxvi. 6 R) are used, the former largely preponderating: aug. retained in *ἐγεγόνειν*, § 16, 2: Att. fut. *γενήσομαι* apparently only in Gen. xvii. 17 *bis*, ="shall be born" (cf. *τίκτω* for Hellenistic *τεχθήσομαι* and *ἐτέχθην*): poet. term. *ἐγινόμεσθα*, § 17, 13.

Γινώσκω (*γειν.* § 6, 24), not *γιγν.* except as a rare v.l., § 7, 32, has the classical tenses: the plpf., apparently only in the compound *διεγνώκειν* N. xxxiii. 56, 2 M. ix. 15, xv. 6, seems to lack early authority: 3rd plur. perf. *ἔγνωκαν*, § 17, 3: the 2nd aor. *ἔγνων* (*ἀνέγνοι=ἀνέγνω* 4 K. xxii. 8 B*) usually has the regular conj. *γνῶ*, in Jdth xiv. 5 *ἐπιγνοῖ* B (*ἐπιγνῷ* ℵA), while in the rare optat. the MSS are divided between the class. *γνοίην* and the later *γνῴην*, which occurs in Job xxiii. 3 A (*γνοίη* Bℵ), 5 B*ℵ* (*γνοίην* A and later hands of Bℵ: cf. similar fluctuation in the moods of the 2nd aor. of *δίδωμι*, § 23, 10): 2nd aor. inf. appears once as *ἐπιγνοῦναι* Est. A 11 ℵ* on the model of *δοῦναι*, so *διαγνοῦναι* in a papyrus of iii/B.C., Mayser 366 (for the converse working of analogy in *δῶναι* see § 6, 34): for *ἐγνώσθην*, *γνωθήσομαι* in B, *vice ἐγνώσθην*, *γνωσθ.*, § 18, 2: verb. adj. *γνωστέον*, § 15, 2.

Γνωρίζω: fut. *γνωριῶ* (Att.) and *-ίσω*, § 20, 1 (i).

Γράφω: aug. always retained in plpf. *ἐγέγραπτο*, § 16, 2, redupl. dropped in *ἐπέγραπτο* A (*ἐγέγραπτο* BF), § 16, 7: tenses regular, perf. *γέγραφα* 1 M. xi. 31, 2 M. i. 7, ix. 25 (not the late *γεγράφηκα*), aor. pass. *ἐγράφην* (*ἀπ-* etc.: not *ἐγράφθην*), fut. pass. *γραφήσομαι* Ψ cxxxviii. 16 (not the more usual Att. *γεγράψομαι*), aor. mid. *ἀπεγραψάμην* Jd. viii. 14 A, Prov. xxii. 20, 3 M. vi. 34.

Γρηγορέω (*ἐγρηγορέω*): new pres., replacing *ἐγρήγορα*, with tenses *ἐγρηγόρουν*, (*ἐ*)*γρηγορήσω*, *ἐγρηγόρησα*, *ἐγρηγορήθην*, found in some, mainly late, books of LXX and frequently in N.T., § 19, 1.

Γρύζω: fut. *γρύξω* (not *γρύξομαι*), § 20, 3.

(**Δείδω**): perf. *δέδοικα -as -ασι -ώs* (not Att. *δέδια* etc.) and pluperf. *ἐδεδοίκειν* (aug. retained, § 16, 2: once in A *ἠδεδοίκειν*, § 16, 3) are used only by the translator of Job, excepting one ex. of *δεδοικότες* in Is. lx. 14.

Δείκνυμι and forms from *δεικνύω*, § 23, 2. The part. *ἐπιδεδ(ε)ιγμένος* in 2 M. ii. 26 (R.V. "taken upon us the painful labour of the abridgement") and 3 M. vi. 26 (Kautzsch "erduldeten") is used where we should expect *ἐπιδεδεγμένος*. The confusion of forms from *δείκνυμι* and *δέχομαι* (*δέκ.*) is perhaps due to Ionic influence: cf. the Homeric use of *δείκνυσθαι* (and *δειδίσκεσθαι*)=*δέχεσθαι* "welcome."

Δεῖ "it is necessary": the impers. *δεῖ*, *ἔδει*, fut. *δεήσει* Jos. xviii. 4, is used occasionally, *δεῖ* being replaced by the para-

phrastic δέον ἐστίν in Sir. prol. *bis* and 1 M. xii. 11 (so Polyb., Aristeas and papyri): no ex. of conj. or opt. since με ᾖ of the uncials in Est. iv. 16 is doubtless right (not δέῃ).

Δέομαι "ask": for the extended use of the uncontracted forms and the peculiar forms ἐδεείτο, ἐνδεείται see § 22, 3: the fut. pass. δεηθήσομαι (ἐν- προσ-) supplants Att. δεήσομαι, § 21, 7: ἐδεήθην (ἐκ- προσ-) and δεδέημαι 3 K. viii. 59 are classical.

Δέχομαι: tenses regular except that the fut. pass. δεχθήσομαι (προσ-) "will be accepted" is new, L. vii. 8, xix. 7, xxii. 23, 25, 27, Sir. xxxii. 20: -εδέχθην with pass. sense is classical: pf. pass. with mid. sense (class.) ἐκδέδεκται Gen. xliv. 32 (in Is. xxii. 3 read δεδεμένοι εἰσίν, A has δεδεγμένοι), for ἐπιδεδειγμένος used like -δεδεγμένος cf. δεικνύναι: verbal adj. ἐκδεκτέον § 15, 2.

Δέω "bind" has the regular tenses δήσω ἔδησα ἐδέθην δεθήσομαι δέδεμαι: ℵ* twice uses forms from δέω "want," δεήσεις Job xxxix. 10, ἐδέησεν ib. Θ xxxvi. 13: the mid. is used only in the 1st aor. (poetical in the *simplex*) ἐδήσατο Jdth xvi. 8, κατεδήσατο τελαμῶνι 3 K. xxi. 38 (the language has a Homeric ring).

Διαλέγομαι: aor. διελέγην, διελεξάμην and (the usual class. form) διελέχθην, fut. διαλεχθήσομαι, § 21, 4 and 6.

Διδάσκω: fut. pass. διδαχθήσομαι Is. lv. 12 is post-classical.

(**Διδράσκω**) only in composition with ἀπο- δια-: the Att. 2nd aor. ἀπέδραν is used in 2nd and 3rd sing. and 3rd plur. -έδρας -έδρα -έδρασαν, conj. ἀποδρᾷ Sir. xxx. 40, part. διαδράς Sir. xi. 10, imperat. ἀπόδραθι (post-classical) Gen. xxvii. 43, xxviii. 2: the 1st sing. appears as ἀπέδρων in Jdth xi. 16, a form which is explained by an ancient writer cited in Rutherford *NP* 335 as a recognized alternative for ἀπέδραν (τὸ δὲ ἀπέδραν τινὲς τῶν ῥητόρων διὰ τοῦ ω εἶπον, ἀπέδρων, ἀλλ' ἄμεινον διὰ τοῦ α), or it would seem possible to take it as a new *imperfect* as from ἀποδράω (the regular -εδίδρασκον however is used elsewhere in LXX): out of the 3rd plur. of the 2nd aor. arose the new 1st aor. ἀπέδρασα which appears in Cod. ℵ, § 21, 1.

Δίδωμι: beginnings of the transition to the -ω (-όω) class, § 23, 5: ἔδωκαν (for ἔδοσαν), ἔδωσα Cod. A, moods of 2nd aor., § 23, 10: term. ἔδωκες A, § 17, 8: aug. omitted in δεδώκειν, § 16, 2.

Δικάζω has Att. fut. δικάσω 1 K. viii. 20, xii. 7 B (Ionic δικᾶν = δικάσειν Hdt. i. 97), but the rare **ἐκδικάζω** has fut. 3rd sing. ἐκδικᾶται "shall take vengeance" or "avenge" L. xix. 18, Dt. xxxii. 43 BF (ἐκδικεῖται A: the following καὶ ἐκδικήσει is perhaps a doublet) § 20, 1 (ii): in Jdth xi. 10 ἐκδικᾶται is used passively "be punished" and the present tense used in the next clause suggests that it is intended for pres. pass. as from †ἐκδικάω (cf. for similar exx. Hatzidakis 395): the classical ἐκδικάζω (unrepresented in N.T.) has in LXX almost disappeared to make way for the new **ἐκδικέω** (tenses regular: in passive -εδικήθην,

-δικηθήσομαι, -δεδίκημαι Gen. iv. 24) which with the subst. *ἐκδίκησις* (Polyb.) is the ordinary word denoting vengeance or punishment: for a trace of an intermediate *ἐκδικᾶν* see § 22, 1.

Διψάω: *διψᾷ* (for Att. *-ῇ*), § 22, 2: fut. *διψάσω*, § 18, 1, and *διψήσομαι*, § 20, 3, as well as Att. *διψήσω*.

Διώκω: fut. usually *διώξομαι* (*καταδιώξομαι*), also *διώξω* (*κατα-*) (Attic prefers the middle), but *ἐκδιώξω* only, § 20, 3: the fut. pass. *ἐκδιωχθήσονται* Ψ xxxvi. 28 ART$\aleph^{c.a}$ is post-classical: 3rd plur. imperf. *ἐδίωκαν* in ℵ, § 17, 4.

Δοκιμάζω (*ἀπο-*): fut. *δοκιμῶ* and *δοκιμάσω* (Att.), § 20, 1 (ii), but in Sir. xxvii. 5, xxxiv. 26 *δοκιμᾷ* of ℵ (=B *δοκιμάζει*) is probably pres. as from *δοκιμάω* (cf. *δοκιμήσῃς* in a papyrus of ii/B.C., Mayser 459, and the subst. *δοκιμή* in N.T.: the ex. of fut. *δοκιμῶ* which Veitch and Kühner-Blass cite from Hdt. I. 199 also appears from the context to be present, *τῷ δὲ πρώτῳ ἐμβαλόντι ἔπεται οὐδὲ ἀποδοκιμᾷ οὐδένα*).

Δολιόω: post-classical N. xxv. 18 and 3 times in Ψ: 3rd plur. imperf. *ἐδολιοῦσαν*, § 17, 5.

Δύναμαι: traces of transition to the *-ω* class in 2nd sing. *δύνῃ* (usually *δύνασαι* in LXX) and variants *δυνόμεθα* etc., §§ 17, 12 and 23, 4: aug. *ἠ-* (usually) or *ἐ-*, § 16, 3: aor. *ἠδυνήθην* (*ἐδ.*) and *ἠδυνάσθην* (*ἐδ.*) ib., also *ἐδυνησάμην* (poet.) Cod. A, § 21, 7: fut. *δυνήσομαι* and in Cod. A *δυνηθήσομαι*, § 21, 7.

Δυναμόω (*ἐν- ὑπερ-*): new verb found in a few late LXX books and in N.T.: aug. *ὑπερηδυνάμωσαν* (like *ἠδυνήθην*), § 16, 3.

Δυσφορέω: 3rd plur. impf. *ἐδυσφόρων* Cod. A (for *-ουν*), § 22, 1.

Δύω, δύνω, -διδύσκω. Apart from pres. and impf. the classical tenses of *δύειν* (*εἰσ- ἐπι- κατα-*) "to sink" (intrans.) are for the most part retained: 2nd aor. *ἔδυν* (not *ἐδύην*, § 21, 3) with inf. *δῦναι* Jd. xiv. 18 A, conj. *δύῃ* L. xxii. 7 AF (ΔΥ B*), fut. *δύσομαι*, pf. *δέδυκα*: a new intrans. 1st aor. *ἔδυσα* (evolved out of the 3rd plur. of *ἔδυν*) appears twice in the compounds *καταδύσωσιν*, *ὑποδύσαντες*, § 21, 1: the trans. fut. *δύσω* "cause to sink" Jl. ii. 10, iii. 15 is late in the *simplex*, cf. *καταδύσω* Mic. vii. 19. The class. fut. and 1st aor., act. and mid., of *ἐκδύειν*, *ἐνδύειν*, "to strip (oneself)," "clothe (oneself)," are also kept, and once the class. impf. *ἐνεδυόμην* Ψ xxxiv. 13: plpf. without aug. *ἐνδεδύκειν* or without reduplication *ἐνεδύκειν* A (cf. *ἐνδύκει* Est. D. 6 B*), § 16, 2 and 7: perf. (only in the part.) *ἐνδεδυμένος* and *ἐνδεδυκώς*, the latter limited to 1 K. xvii. 5, 2 K. vi. 14 and "Ezekiel *α*" (ix. 2, 3, 11, x. 2, 6, 7, xxiii. 6 [A mid.], 12 [do.]: contrast in Ez. *β* *ἐνδεδυμένους* xxxviii. 4 BAQ).

The *pres. and impf.* of the *intransitive* verb "to set," "sink" are always formed from **δύνω** (Ionic: in Att. prose not before Xen.), § 19, 3: *δύνει* Eccl. i. 5, *δύνοντος* 3 K. xxii. 36, 2 Ch. xviii. 34 A, Jos. viii. 29 (*ἐπι-*), *ἔδυνε* 2 K. ii. 24, so *ἐκδύνει*

"escapes" Prov. xi. 8 (*δύνει* A): the aor. *δύναντος* 2 Ch. xviii. 34 B is late (Polyb. ix. 15 Schweigh.), § 21, 1. The reading of B*א* in Is. lx. 20 *οὐ γὰρ δυνήσεται ὁ ἥλιός σοι* (*δύσεται* cett.) is remarkable: a fut. mid. of this form from *δύνω* is unexampled, and if the fut. of *δύναμαι* is intended the reading cannot be original: the two roots are elsewhere confused, e.g. 2 K. xvii. 17 and the readings in 1 Ch. xii. 18.

To express the *transitive* meanings "put on," "put off" the new forms **ἐν- ἐκ- διδύσκω** are used in pres. and impf., apparently first attested in LXX (also in N.T. and Jos.), § 19, 3.

Ἐάω: tenses regular with aug. *εἰ-*, except for 3rd plur. impf. *ἐῶσαν* Jer. xli. 10, beside *εἴων* elsewhere, § 16, 5: aor. pass. *(ε)ἰάθην* and in Cod. A *(ε)ἰάσθην*, § 18, 2: for the itacism cf. *ἴασα* Job xxxi. 34 A.

Ἐγγίζω: *προσ-* (Aristot. and Polyb.: LXX usually intr. "draw near," occasionally trans. "bring near" Gen. xlviii. 10 etc., as also in Polyb.): fut. *ἐγγιῶ*, § 20, 1 (i): *ἤγγικα, ἤγγισα*.

Ἐγγυάω: medial aug. in *ἐνεγυησάμην* (for *ἠγγυησ.*), § 16, 8.

Ἐγείρω "raise up" (no ex. of intrans. use of act.): aug. usually inserted in *ἐξηγειρόμην ἐξηγέρθην*, § 16, 4: the two perfects are rare, the classical *ἐγρήγορα* "watch," "be awake" occurring only twice (elsewhere replaced by *γρηγορέω* q.v.), the later *ἐγήγερμαι* only in Zech. ii. 13 *ἐξ-* "is risen," Jdth i. 4 א *διεγηγερμένας* of gates raised to a certain height (*διεγειρομένας* BA): aor. pass. *ἠγέρθην* (not *ἠγρόμην*), § 21, 6: fut. pass. *(ἐξ- ἐπ-)εγερθήσομαι* N. xxiv. 19, Mic. v. 5, Is. xix. 2 etc. is late (Babrius).

Εἰλέω: 1 aor. *(ἀν)είλησα*[1] late (Att. *εἶλα*, Ep. *ἕλσα*), § 21, 2: perf. pass. (late in *simplex*, *ἀπειλημένον* Hdt. II. 141, *περιειλημένην* in iii/B.C., Mayser 337) *εἰλημένος* Is. xi. 5 BQ (*-ημμ.* אA), *ἐνειλημένος* 1 K. xxi. 9 B (*-ημμ.* A), *κατειλημένος* 2 Ch. ix. 20 A (*-ημμ.* B).

Εἰμί, § 23, 11: 2 sg. fut. *ἔσῃ* and *ἔσει*, § 17, 12: *ἔστωσαν*, § 17, 6.

Εἶπον, εἴρηκα etc.: see *λέγω*.

Ἐκκλησιάζω: medial aug. in aor. *ἐξεκλησίασα*, § 16, 8.

Ἐλαττονέομαι and more rarely **ἐλαττονέω** (*-ττ-* not *-σσ-*, § 7, 45) with same meaning "fail" etc. appear for the first time in LXX beside the class. **ἐλαττόω** (*-ττ-* and *-σσ-*, § 7, 45): aug. omitted in *ἐλαττονώθη*, § 16, 4.

Ἐλαύνω: fut. *-ελάσω* (not *ἐλῶ*), § 20, 1 (iii): aor. and plpf. pass. *συνελασθέντων, συνήλαστο* late (Att. *ἠλάθην, ἠληλάμην*), § 18, 2.

Ἐλεάω usually supplants the older *ἐλεέω*, § 22, 1.

Ἑλίσσω: not the Ionic and late *εἴλ.*, except in A which has *εἰλιχθείη* Job xviii. 8 and verbal adj. *εἰλικτός* 3 K. vi. 13: 2nd fut. pass. *ἑλιγήσομαι* is post-classical, § 21, 4.

[1] The corresponding fut. only in Job xl. 21 A ΕΙΛΗCΕΙC, a corruption of ΕΙ ΑΗCΕΙC.

Ἕλκω: fut. *ἑλκύσω ἐξ- παρ-* (Ionic for Att. *ἕλξω*): the 1st aor. *εἵλκυσα* (*ἧλκυσα*, § 16, 5) and pass. *εἱλκύσθην* (*ἐξ- ἐφ-*) have early authority (the late *εἱλξα*, *εἵλχθην* do not occur in LXX).

Ἐμποδοστατέω: a new verb "obstruct": the perf. with irregular medial reduplication, *ἐμπεποδεστάτηκας*, appears in a corrupted form in Jd. xi. 35 A, § 16, 8.

Ἐνεχυράζω: aug. *ἠνεχύρασα* and *ἐνεχ.*, § 16, 8: fut. *-άσω* Dt. xxiv. 6 B and *-ῶ -ᾷς* ib. AF*, 17 B^{ab}AF.

Ἐνθυμέομαι: fut. *ἐνθυμηθήσομαι* (late) and *-μήσομαι* (Att.), § 21, 7: *-εθυμήθην*, *-τεθύμημαι* classical.

Ἐννυπνιάζομαι: the verb appears to be Ionic (Hippocrates, and then not before Aristot., who uses the active): aor. *ἠννυπνιάσθην* (or *ἐν.*) and *ἠννυπνιασάμην* (or *ἐν.*), § 16, 4 and 8: fut. *ἐννυπνιασθήσομαι* Jl. ii. 28.

Ἐνωτίζεσθαι: verb frequent in LXX, once in N.T., unattested elsewhere, possibly a "Biblical" creation to render the hiphil of הֶאֱזִין: aug. *ἐνωτισάμην* and *ἠν.*, § 16, 8.

Ἐπαξονέω "register," "enroll" (like *ἀπογράφειν*), a *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον* in N. i. 18 B *ἐπηξονοῦσαν*, § 17, 5.

Ἐπίσταμαι: aug. *ἠπιστάμην* and v.l. *ἐπ.*, § 16, 4: 2 sing. *ἐπίστασαι* and *ἐπίστῃ*, §§ 17, 12 and 23, 4.

Ἐργάζομαι: fut. *κατεργᾶ -ᾶται -ῶνται* (never Att. *ἐργάσομαι*), § 20, 1 (ii): aug. *ἠργαζόμην* but *εἴργασμαι* (as in Att.), aor. *ἠργασάμην* and *εἰργασάμην*, § 16, 5: the perf. is used only with pass. meaning[1] (in Attic it has active sense as well): fut. pass. *ἐργασθήσομαι* (class.) Ez. xxxvi. 34.

Ἐρευνάω and **ἐραυνάω**, § 6, 12: 3rd plur. impf. (as from *ἐρευνέω*) *ἠρεύνουν*, § 22, 1.

Ἐρημόω: aug., usually *ἠ-*, sometimes omitted, § 16, 4.

Ἕρπω (*ἐξ-*): 1 aor. *ἐξῆρψα* Ψ civ. 30, with causative meaning "produced," "made to swarm" (cf. *ἐξαμαρτάνειν* "cause to sin"), is unclassical, Att. using *εἵρπυσα* from *ἑρπύζω* for "crept" (Veitch cites *εἷρψα* from Dio Chrys.).

Ἔρχομαι[2]: in Att. the pres. stem in the *simplex* is confined to pres. ind., while the moods, imperf. and fut. are supplied from

[1] Including Dt. xxi. 3 *δάμαλιν...ἥτις οὐκ εἴργασται*: witness the Heb. Pual (R.V. "has not been worked with") and the undoubtedly passive use of the tense in the next *v.* Cod. A has an active aor. *ἠργάσατε* in 2 K. xi. 20, a corruption of *ἠγγίσατε*.

[2] A common synonym in LXX and later Greek is *παραγίνομαι*, this use being possibly of Ionic origin: apart from Hdt. it seems to be rare in classical Greek. The distribution of the word in LXX is noticeable, esp. its absence from Dan. Θ and books akin to Θ, 2 Es. and 1 and 2 Ch. (except 2 Ch. xxiv. 24): in non-historical portions its absence (Ψ and Prov.) or rarity (Prophetical books) is more easily intelligible. In N.T. it is almost confined to Luke's writings.

εἶμι: LXX employs *ἠρχόμην*, *ἔρχωμαι* etc. with fut. *ἐλεύσομαι* (Epic, Ionic and poet.), *εἶμι* being now rare and literary (§ 23, 12): aor. *ἦλθον* with new terminations *ἦλθα*, *ἐλθάτω* etc., § 17, 2, *ἤλθοσαν*, § 17, 5, opt. *ἔλθοισαν*, § 17, 7.

Ἐρωτάω: aug. *ἠ-* but *ἐπ-ερώτησα* etc., § 16, 4: 3rd plur. impf. *ἐπηρώτουν* Cod. A, § 22, 1.

Ἔσθίω and **ἔσθω** (esp. in the part. *ἔσθων*), § 19, 3: fut. *ἔδομαι* (rare outside Pent.) and Hellenistic *φάγομαι*, § 20, 2, with 2nd sing. *φάγεσαι* and occasionally *φάγῃ*, § 17, 12 (*φαγούμεθα* Gen. iii. 2 D^{sil}): terminations of past tenses *ἔφαγα*, § 17, 2, *ἐφάγοσαν*, *κατεφάγεσαν*, *ἤσθοσαν*, § 17, 5, *φάγοισαν*, § 17, 7. The rare pres. **βιβρώσκω** once in Jd. B, § 19, 3: the tenses *βέβρωκα* (*βεβρώκει*, § 16, 2), *βέβρωμαι*, *ἐβρώσθην* (opt. *βρωθείησαν* Job xviii. 13) are Ionic and late: fut. pass. *βρωθήσομαι* is new. The Att. *ἐδήδοκα*, *ἐδήδεσμαι*, *ἠδέσθην* have disappeared and the vulgar *τρώγω* of St John's Gospel is unrepresented.

Εὐαγγελίζομαι "tell good tidings": the act. *-ίζω* (as in Apoc. x. 7, xiv. 6) occurs in 1 K. xxxi. 9 *-ίζοντες* (=mid. in the ‖ 1 Ch. x. 9), with fut. *εὐαγγελιῶ* 2 K. xviii. 19 (mid. *-οῦμαι* in next *v.* and elsewhere): otherwise only in the mid.-pass., aor. mid. *εὐηγγελισάμην* (class.), § 16, 8, and once aor. pass. *εὐαγγελισθήτω ὁ κύριός μου* 2 K. xviii. 31="receive the good tidings" (cf. Hebr. iv. 6).

Εὐαρεστέω: aug. *εὐηρέστησα*, § 16, 8.

Εὐδοκέω (Polyb. and papyri of ii/B.C.): aug. omitted in *εὐδόκησα*, § 16, 4: aor. pass. *εὐδοκήθη* 1 Ch. xxix. 23="prospered" (perhaps a corruption of *εὐοδώθη*, cf. Is. liv. 17 A).

Εὐθηνέω: Ionic and late for older Attic *εὐθενέω*: once in pres. mid. Ψ lxxii. 12 B**א*** (class.): 3rd plur. impf. *εὐθηνοῦσαν*, § 17, 5.

Εὐθύνειν (*κατ-*): aug. *κατεύθυνα*, § 16, 4.

Εὐλαβέομαι: fut. *εὐλαβηθήσομαι* only (Aristot.: not *εὐλαβήσομαι* as in Plato), § 21, 7.

Εὐλογέω: aug. *εὐλόγησα*, § 16, 4: term. *εὐλογοῦσαν*, § 17, 5, *εὐλογήσαισαν* Tob. iii. 11: late tenses *εὐλόγηκα -ημαι -ηθήσομαι*.

Εὑρίσκω: aug. omitted in *εὗρον*, *εὕρηκα*, *εὑρέθην*, § 16, 4: terminations *εὗρα*, § 17, 2, *εὕροσαν*, § 17, 5, *εὕροισαν*, § 17, 7 (1st aor. *εὗρησα* not used, § 21, 1).

Εὐφραίνω: aug. *εὐφράνθην* and *ηὐφρ.*, § 16, 4: fut. pass. *εὐφρανθήσομαι* (not *εὐφρανοῦμαι*), § 21, 7.

Εὔχομαι (*προσ-*): aug. usually *προσηυξάμην*, also *-ευξ.*, § 16, 4, and *ἐπροσηυξάμην*, § 16, 8.

Ἔχω: fut. *ἕξω* (not *σχήσω*), § 15, 3: 3rd plur. aor. *ἔσχοσαν*, § 17, 5: 1 aor. pass. (Ionic and late) *κατ- συν- εσχέθην*, with v.ll. in A *συνεσχέσθη*, § 18, 2, and *κατησχέθη* 3 M. v. 12: fut. pass. *-σχεθήσομαι* (late: 112 B.C. is the earliest ex. in papyri, AP 31, 6), R. i. 13 (*κατα-*), Job Θ xxxvi. 8: class. perf. *ἔσχηκα* rare, Sir.

xiii. 6 and in 2, 3 M.: the mid., excepting *ἀνέχομαι* (aug. *ἀνεσχ-όμην* § 16, 8), is almost confined to the part. *ἐχόμενος -ον -α* = "near."

Ζάω or *ζήω*: fut. *ζήσομαι* and *ζήσω*, the latter sometimes with causative sense "quicken" = *ζωώσω* elsewhere, § 20, 3: aor. *ἔζησα* (Attic usually employed *ἐβίων*): as from *ζῆμι* 1st sing. impf. *ἔζην* (not *ἔζων*) and 2 sing. imperat. *ζῆθι* (post-class.), § 22, 2.

Ζεύγνυμι, ζευγνύω (*ἀνα-*): § 23, 2.

Ζηλόω: *ἐζήλησα* Cod. ℵ as from *-έω*, § 22, 4.

Ζωννύω (*περι-* etc.) but mid. *περιζώννυται*, § 23, 2: fut. act. *ζώσω* (post-class.) Ex. xxix. 9: fut. mid. *ζώσομαι* (once in a Hexaplaric interpolation in A *περιζῶνται* Ez. xxvii. 31 = *περιζώσονται* Q ib.) with aorists *ἔζωσα, ἐζωσάμην* are classical: perf. pass. *ἀν- περι- ὑπ- εζωσμένος* (Ionic: Att. *ἔζωμαι*), § 18, 2.

Ἡγέομαι: (1) with the meaning "lead" frequent in the part. *ἡγούμενος* = *ἡγεμών*: the tenses (class.) are rare, *ἡγεῖτο* Ex. xiii. 21, *ἡγήσεται* Mic. ii. 13, Bar. v. 9, *ἡγήσατο* Gen. xlix. 26: (2) with the meaning "think," "think good" only in literary books (Job, W., 2—4 M.) with tenses *ἡγησάμην* and (Job) *ἥγημαι* with act. meaning.

Ἥκω in virtue of its perfect meaning "am come"[1] in late Greek adopts in the plur. and occasionally in the inf. and part. forms as from a perfect *ἧκα*: the conjugation in LXX as in the papyri (Mayser 372) is thus *ἧκω -εις -ει -αμεν -ατε -ασιν* (the last very frequent: *ἥκουσιν* only in Job xvi. 23 A): the perf. part. appears once as *ἡκώς* in 4 M. iv. 2 A (*ἥκων* ℵV and so elsewhere in LXX: the papyri show both forms, Mayser ib.): inf. *ἥκειν* 4 M. iv. 6 (*ἡκέναι* papyri): imperat. (rare in class. Gk) *ἧκε* 2 K. xiv. 32, Jer. xliii. 14, xlvii. 4 ℵAQ, Tob. ix. 3 ℵ, *ἐπάνηκε* Prov. iii. 28, *ἥκετε* Gen. xlv. 18, Is. xlv. 20: fut. *ἥξω* frequent = "will come" not "will have come" (the late aor. *ἧξα* is unrepresented).

Θάλλω (*ἀνα-*): new 2nd aor. *ἀνέθαλον* (Att. *ἔθηλα*, Aelian *ἀνέθηλα*) used intransitively "revive," § 21, 2: the pres. *ἀναθάλλω* (the compound is unclass.) is used transitively "make to flourish" Sir. i. 18 etc., Ez. xvii. 24.

Θαμβέω: in class. Greek "be amazed (at)," so 1 K. xiv. 15: in LXX also causatively "frighten," *ἐθάμβησάν με* 2 K. xxii. 5, with pass. *θαμβέομαι*, aor. *ἐθαμβήθην*, § 21, 6.

Θαυμάζω: fut. *θαυμάσομαι* (Att.) and *-σω*, § 20, 3: *ἐθαυμάσθην, θαυμασθήσομαι* keep their class. passive meaning (*θαυμασθῆναι*

[1] "Ηκει in Eccl. v. 14 is used as an aorist "he came," answering to *παρεγένετο* in the next *v.* The impf. *ἧκε* in 2 M. 5 times and Jdth xi. 1 ℵ.

Est. C. 21 is perhaps deponent), § 21, 6: perf. pass. *τεθαυμασμένος* 4 K. v. 1 (Polyb.).

Θέλω, fut. *θελήσω*, no longer (Att.) *ἐθέλω*, *ἐθελήσω*, consequently has the new perf. *τεθέληκα*, § 16, 7: but the old aug. is invariably kept in *ἤθελον*, *ἠθέλησα*, § 16, 3: term. *ἤθελαν* in ℵ, § 17, 4. The use of *εὐδόκησα* in Jd. (B text) = *ἠθέλησα* (A text) is noticeable.

Θερίζω: fut. *-ιῶ* and *-ίσω*, § 20, 1 (i).

Θερμαίνω: aor. *ἐθέρμανα* since Aristot. for *-ηνα*, § 18, 4.

Θεωρέω: as in N.T. almost confined to pres. and impf., the aor. *ἐθεώρησα -ήθην* occurring 4 times in literary books, with Ψ lxvii. 25 *-ήθησαν*: 3rd pl. impf. in Jdth x. 10 *ἐθεώρων* ℵ, § 22, 1, *ἐθεωροῦσαν* A, § 17, 5 (2). The tenses in N.T. are supplied from **θεάομαι**: *ἐθεασάμην* in LXX is rare, and *τεθέαμαι* occurs once only.

Θνήσκω *ἀπο-*: the Att. rule as to the use of *simplex* for perf. and plupf., compound for fut. and aor. is still observed[1]: perf. *τέθνηκα -κέναι -κώς*, the forms *τεθνέασιν* (=Att. *τεθνᾶσι*) *-ναμεν -νεῶτες* in literary books, § 23, 7: plpf. *τεθνήκει*, A § 16, 2: fut. perf. *τεθνήξομαι* (=older Att. *τεθνηξῶ*) 3 times in the Atticising 4 M.: terminations *ἀπέθανον*, § 17, 2, *-εθάνοσαν -εθνησοσαν*, § 17, 5.

Θραύω: fut. pass. (late) *θραυσθήσομαι* and once in B *θραυθήσομαι*, § 18, 2: aor. pass. *ἐθραύσθην* is classical.

Θυμιάω θυμιάζω "burn incense": pres. and impf. always from *-άω* (class.) except *θυμιάζουσιν* Is. lxv. 3 A: other tenses from *-άζω*, fut. *-άσω*, aor. *ἐθυμίασα* Hdt. *-ασα* *-ασθην* 1 K. ii. 15 f.: 3rd pl. impf. *ἐθυμιῶσαν*, § 17, 5: as from *-έω θυμιοῦσιν* ℵ, § 22, 1.

(**Ἵημι**) only in compounds: *ἀφίω συνίω* etc., § 23, 6: aug. omitted in *ἀνέθην*, *ἀφέθην*, but *παρεθήσαν*, § 16, 5: term. *ἀφῆκες*, § 17, 8.

Ἱκανόομαι: unclass., usually impersonal in the phrase *ἱκανοῦσθω* (*ἡμῖν*): aor. *ἱκανώθην*: 2 sing. Cod. A *ἱκανώσω*, § 17, 12.

Ἱλάσκομαι: the *simplex*, in class. Greek "propitiate," "appease," in LXX is used not of the suppliant but of the Divine Pardoner, "be merciful," "forgive" (=*ἵλεως γενέσθαι* elsewhere), in the aor. pass. *ἱλάσθην* impt. *ἱλάσθητι* (=Epic *ἱλήθι*, in same sense) and fut. *mid.* *ἱλάσομαι* 4 K. v. 18 *bis*, Ψ xxiv. 11, lxiv. 4, lxxvii. 38 and probably in 2 Ch. vi. 30 ΙΑΣΗ should be read for ΙΑΣΗ, cf. v. 27, once in the fut. pass. *ἱλασθήσεται* 4 K. v. 18 A. Far commoner is the compound **ἐξιλάσκομαι**, fut. *-άσομαι*, aor. *-ασάμην*, used like the class. *simplex* = "propitiate" man (Gen. xxxii. 20, Prov. xvi. 14) or God (Ecclus. vii. 2, viii. 22, Mal. i. 9), but usually abs. "make propitiation" of the priest *περί τινος passim*, sometimes with acc. of the thing for which

[1] E.g. Eccl. iv. 2 *τοὺς τεθνηκότας τοὺς ἤδη ἀποθανόντας*. The uncompounded fut. *θανεῖται* in Prov. xiii. 14, possibly for metrical reasons.

atonement is made[1] (*ἁμαρτίας* etc. Sir. iii. 3+, Ez. xliii. 22+, Dan. Θ ix. 24) and once with acc. of the propitiatory offering, 2 Ch. xxix. 24: fut. pass. *ἐξιλασθήσομαι* (unclass.)="shall be expiated" or "forgiven" N. xxxv. 33, Dt. xxi. 8, 1 K. iii. 14, vi. 3: A reads *ἐξιλᾶτο* as from *-άομαι* in Sir. xvi. 7. The *simplex* has thus become a deponent verb "be propitious," and the causative sense "make propitious" must now be expressed by prefixing *ἐξ-* (cf. *ἐξαμαρτάνειν*).

Ἵπτημι: see *πέτομαι*.

Ἵστημι, ἱστάω (**ἱστάνω**), fut. once in A *ἱστήσω*, § 23, 3: pres. *στήκω* (*παρα-*), § 19, 1: pf. forms with new trans. pf. *ἕστακα*, § 23, 7, *κατ-* *ἐπ-*, § 8, 7: aor., § 23, 8 and 9: aug. *ἱστήκειν εἱστ. ἑστ.*, § 16, 5, double aug. *ἀπεκατέστησα*, § 16, 8: term. *-έστηκαν*, § 17, 3.

Καθαίρω (*ἐκ- περι-*), the class. verb for "cleanse" in literal and met. senses, in LXX is quite rare and restricted to the lit. sense in the *simplex* (="winnow" wheat 2 K. iv. 6, and fennel Is. xxviii. 27) and in comp. with *ἐκ-* (Dt. xxvi. 13="clear out" goods from a house, Jos. xvii. 15 "clear" a forest [but *ἐκκαθαριεῖς v.* 18 in same sense], Jd. vii. 4 B "thin" an army, "weed out" the inefficient), cf. *περι-* Dt. xviii. 10, Jos. v. 4, 4 M. i. 29: aor. *-εκάθᾱρα* (once *-ηρα* Jos. v. 4 A), § 18, 4. (**Καθαριόω** in Lam. iv. 7 is a *ἅπ. λεγ.*) Far more frequent is the unclass. **καθαρίζω** (*ἐκ- περι-*), mainly and apparently originally with metaphorical meaning, but afterwards (see N.T.) used in all senses: Deissmann *BS* 216 f. has shown that the ceremonial use of the word is not wholly "Biblical": fut. *καθαριῶ* with v. l. *-ίσω*, § 20, 1 (i): aor. *ἐκαθάρισα*: pass. *καθαρισθήσομαι ἐκαθαρίσθην κεκαθαρισμένος*: for *ἐκαθέρισα* etc., § 6, 3, Moulton *Prol.* ed. 3, 56 note.

Καθίζω, καθέζομαι, κάθημαι. From *καθίζω* (pres. and impf. have disappeared and the late pf. *κεκάθικα* is unrepresented) we have aor. *ἐκάθισα*, used, as in Att., both intransitively "sat," "seated myself," and, less often, transitively "caused to sit": Att. fut. *καθιῶ* is also both trans. (as always in Attic) Dt. xxv. 2, Jer. xxxix. 37, Ez. xxxii. 4 (*ἐπι-*), Job Θ xxxvi. 7 and intrans. Jl. iii. 12, Is. xiv. 13, xlvii. 8: fut. *καθίσω* (Ion., vulgar and late) only in Sir. xi. 1 B (trans.). The middle is now confined to the fut. (Att. *καθιζήσομαι*) which appears in three forms: (i) *καθίσομαι*[2] Dan. Θ vii. 26 only, (ii) *καθιοῦμαι* 1 Es. iii. 7, Ψ cxxxi. 12, Hos. xiv. 8, Mal. iii. 3 and in the following passages (except Jd.) as a v.l. for (iii) a form unrecorded in the grammars *καθίομαι*[3] Jd.

[1] Cf. Deissmann *BS* 224 f.

[2] Swete prints it also in Jd. vi. 18 (*καθίομαι* B, *καθήσομαι* A). It may be merely an itacistic form of *καθήσομαι*.

[3] The form appears to have grown out of the 3rd sing. *καθιεῖται* which was written as *καθίεται* from the objection felt to two contiguous *ι* sounds:

vi. 18 B, 3rd plur. *καθίονται* Sir. xxxviii. 33 A, 3rd sing. *καθίεται* in Cod. B, Dt. xxi. 13, 3 K. i. 13, Jer. xxxix. 5, Dan. Θ xi. 10, and in B𝔎 in Zech. vi. 13, Is. xvi. 5, Ψ xxviii. 10.

From *καθέζομαι* we have the Att. fut. *καθεδοῦμαι* twice Jer. xxxvii. 18, Ez. xxvi. 16: the late fut. *καθεσθήσομαι* L. xii. 5 B (4 B^{ab}F), and the late aor. *καθεσθείς* Job (? Θ) xxxix. 27.

Κάθημαι, *ἐκαθήμην* are now the only pres. and imperf. for the verb "to sit": 2nd sing. *κάθησαι* (not *κάθῃ* of N.T.), but imperat. usually *κάθου* (once *κάθησο*), § 23, 13: the unclassical fut. *καθήσομαι* is fairly common, ib.

Καθιζάνω (early in poetry with intrans. sense) is used transitively in Job xii. 18 (*καθίζων* A), Prov. xviii. 16.

Καίω: the old Att. *κάω*[1] in *κάηται* Ex. xxvii. 20 B, *ἐκκάει* Prov. xiv. 5 𝔎, *καομένη* Mal. iv. 1 Q: tenses regular with 2nd aor. pass. (dialectic) *ἐξ-κατ-εκάην*, fut. pass. (late) *ἐκ-κατα-καήσομαι*, § 21, 4.

Καλέω: fut. *καλέσω*, § 20, 1 (iii): fut. perf. pass. *κεκλήσομαι* only as a variant for *κληθήσομαι* in Ex. xii. 16 A, Hos. xi. 12 BQ, cf. § 15, 3: aug. in *ἐπαρεκάλουν*, *ἐπροσκέκληται*, § 16, 8: vb. adj. *κλητέον*, § 15, 2.

Καλύπτω: *ἀνακάλυψα* 𝔎, § 16, 2.

Καυχάομαι: 2 sing. *ἐνκαυχᾷ* (not the later *-ᾶσαι*), § 17, 12.

Κεῖμαι: regular § 23, 13, partially replaced by *τέθειμαι*, ib. 10.

Κελεύω: *κελευθέντες* Cod. A (for *-ενσθ.*), § 18, 2.

(**Κεράννυμι**): pres. part. *κεράνντες*, § 23, 2: perf. pass. *κεκέρασμαι* (late), with doubtful authority for *κέκραμαι* (Att.), aor. pass. *ἐκεράσθην συν-* (Att. also has *ἐκράθην*), § 18, 2.

Κιρνάω a collateral form of *κίρνημι*: impf. *ἐκίρνων* Ψ ci. 10; as the *-μι* forms are usually retained in the mid., *μετεκιρνᾶτο* W. xvi. 21 (Swete) should probably be *μετεκίρνατο*.

Κιχράω not *κίχρημι*, § 23, 4.

Κλαίω: not Att. *κλᾶω*, but *ἔκλαεν* 3 K. xviii. 45 B: fut. *κλαύσομαι* (not the later *-σω* of N.T.), § 20, 3: aor. and fut. pass. *ἐκλαύσθην* (*-αύθην* B), *κλαυσθήσομαι* (v.l. *κλαυθ.*) are post-classical, § 18, 2: the perf. pass. is unattested.

Κλείω with tenses *κλείσω* etc. (not the old Att. *κλήω κλήσω* etc.): perf. pass. *κέκλεισμαι* and rarely (class.) *-ειμαι*, § 18, 2: fut. pass. *κλεισθήσομαι* (late in *simplex*: Xen. has it in comp.) ib.

Κλίνω: pf. act. *κέκλικα* (late) Jd. xix. 9 A, 11 A (*-ηκ-*), 3 K. ii. 28, 4 K. viii. 1 A, Jer. vi. 4: aor. and fut. pass. *ἐκλίθην*, *κλιθήσομαι* (not *ἐκλίνην*, *κλινήσ.*, nor the mid. aor. and fut.), § 21, 5: other tenses classical: the *simplex* is absent from the Hexateuch, the intrans. use of it (of time Jd. and Jer. l.c., and elsewhere in other senses) is late.

cf. *ταμιεῖον—ταμεῖον* etc., § 5 (3). Note that Cod. B keeps 3rd plur. *καθιοῦνται* Hos. xiv. 8.

[1] Mayser quotes an ex. in ii/B.C., 104 f.

Κνίζω (poetical and in late prose): aor. *ἀπέκνισα* and (Cod. A) *ἀπέκνιξα*, § 18, 3 (iii).

Κοιμάομαι: 2nd sing. *κοιμᾶσαι* Cod. A, § 17, 12: fut. pass. *κοιμηθήσομαι*, § 21, 7, and perf. *κεκοίμημαι* N. v. 19, 4 K. iv. 32 A, Is. xiv. 8 are post-classical.

Κολλάω (*προσ-*) mainly in the passive with new reflexive sense of cleaving to a person, with tenses *ἐκολλήθην κολληθήσομαι κεκόλλημαι*: aug. omitted in *κεκόλλητο*, § 16, 2.

Κομίζω: fut. *κομιῶ* 3 M. i. 8, *-ιοῦμαι* and *-ίσομαι*, § 20, 1 (i).

Κόπτω: fut. mid. *κόψομαι* "will bewail" Jer.-Ez.-Min. Proph., 3 K. xii. 24 m B, xiv. 13 A lacks early authority[1]: fut. pass. *κοπήσομαι*, late in *simplex*, = (*a*) "shall be cut down" Jer. xxvi. 5 (so *ἐκκοπήσ.* Dan. Θ ix. 26), (*b*) "shall be bewailed" Jer. viii. 2, xvi. 4: the other act. and mid. tenses are classical, pf. act. wanting: opt. term. *ἐκκόψαισαν*, § 17, 7.

Κουφίζω: fut. *-ιῶ* and *-ίσω*, § 20, 1 (i).

Κράζω: the pres. rare in Att. is equally so in LXX, *κράζεις* Jd. xviii. 24, else in the part. Ex. xxxii. 17, 2 K. xiii. 19, Ψ lxviii. 4, Jdth xiv. 17 B, and inf. Ψ xxxi. 3, Tob. ii. 13 BℵA, impf. *ἔκραζον* Jd. xviii. 22 A: elsewhere the pf. *κέκραγα* is used with pres. sense as in Attic, Ex. v. 8, 2 K. xix. 28, Jer. xxxi. 3 etc.: fut. *κεκράξομαι* as in Att. (with v.l. *κράξομαι*: not *κράξω* of N.T.), § 20, 3, cf. 15, 3: the aor. takes 3 (or 4) forms, the third only being classical: (i) usually *ἐκέκραξα*, (ii) *ἔκραξα* rarely and in books using pres. *κράζω*, but always *ἀνέκραξα*, (iii) *ἀνέκραγον*, (iv) possibly redupl. 2nd aor. *ἐκέκραγον*, unless this should be regarded as impf. from †*κεκράγω*, §§ 21, 1: 19, 1. **Κραυγάζω** is properly used of an animal's bleat in *κρανάζειν* Tob. ii. 13 A (with loss of *γ*, § 7, 30: *κράζειν* BℵA), of a human cry in *ἐκραύγασεν* 2 Es. iii. 13.

(**Κρεμάννυμι**) **κρεμάζω κρέμαμαι**: the act. goes over to the *-ω* class, *κρεμάζων* (*κρεμνῶν* A) in Job Θ, §§ 19, 3 and 23, 2: in the mid. the Att. *κρέμαμαι* remains, § 23, 4: fut. *κρεμάσω* for Att. *κρεμῶ*: *ἐκρέμασα -άσθην* as in Att.

Κρίνω: aor. and fut. pass. for mid. in the compounds *ἀπεκρίθην* (with *ἀπεκρινάμην*) *ἀποκριθήσομαι*, *διεκρίθην διακριθήσομαι*, *ὑπεκρίθην* (but *ὑποκρίνασθαι* 4 M.), § 21, 6: the simple fut. pass. *κριθήσομαι* (class.) has mid. sense "contend," "plead with" in Jer. ii. 9, Job xiii. 19 (*-σόμενος*), pass. "be judged" Is. lxvi. 16: aug. in *ἐδιέκρινεν* ℵ, § 16, 8: term. *ἐκρίνοσαν*, § 17, 5: Cod. C writes *κέκρινεν* for *κέκρικεν* Job xxvii. 2.

Κρύπτω and new pres. **κρύβω**, § 19, 3: aor. and fut. pass.

[1] In Jer. xxxi. 37 *πᾶσαι χεῖρες κόψονται* it appears from the Heb. to keep the meaning "cut" and may even perhaps stand for the passive "shall be cut" (cf. Or. Sib. III. 651=731 *οὐδὲ μὲν* [*γὰρ*] *ἐκ δρυμοῦ ξύλα κόψεται*).

(usually with mid. sense) *ἐκρύβην*, *κρυβήσομαι*, § 21, 4 (class. *ἐκρύφθην*, (*ἀπ*)*εκρυψάμην*, (*ἀπο*)*κρύψομαι* unused).

Κτάομαι: 2 sing. *κτᾶσαι*, § 17, 12: class. tenses in use *κέκτημαι* (not *ἔκτ.*), § 16, 7, *κτήσομαι*, *ἐκτησάμην*: new fut. pass. *κτηθήσονται* "shall be acquired" Jer. xxxix. 15 (B*ℵ* incorrectly *κτισθ.*) 43: verb. adj. *ἐπίκτητος* 2 M. vi. 23.

Κτείνω (*ἀπο- κατα-*): the *simplex* only[1] in Prov. xxiv. 11 (unclass. passive *κτεινομένους*), xxv. 5, 3 M. i. 2: *κατακτείνειν* (poet.) 4 M. xi. 3, xii. 11: new pres. (beside *-κτείνω*) *ἀποκτέννω*, § 19, 2: perf. *ἀπέκτανκα* (late for usual Att. *ἀπέκτονα*) N. xvi. 41, 1 K. xxiv. 12, 2 K. iv. 11: *-κτενῶ*, *-έκτεινα*, regular: new passive tenses (in Att. expressed by *ἀπέθανον* etc.) are the aor. *ἀπεκτάνθην*, § 21, 5, and perf. pass. in the two forms *ἀπεκταμμένων*[2] 1 M. v. 51 A (*-κταμένων ℵ*, *-κταμένων* V*) and *ἀπεκτονῆσθαι* 2 M. iv. 36 V (*ἀπεκτόνησεν* A).

Κυλίω, impf. *ἐκύλιον*, replaces the older pres. in *-ίνδω*: the tenses *ἐκύλισα ἐνεκυλίσθην* (*ἐγ*)*κυλισθήσομαι* have early authority.

Κύπτω: fut. *κύψω* (for *-ομαι*), § 20, 3: perf. *ἐκκέκυφα* Jer. vi. 1.

(**Κύρω, κυρέω**) *προσ- συγ-*: § 22, 3.

Κύω (*κύουσι* Is. lix. 4, *ἐκύομεν* 13) and **κυέω** (*ἀποκυήσασα* 4 M. xv. 17) are both classical.

Λαλέω: pf. *ἐλάληκα* in A and ℵ, § 16, 7: part. *λαλοντα* ℵ= *-ῶντα* (for *-οῦντα*), § 22, 1.

Λαμβάνω: fut. *λήμψομαι* (*λάμψομαι*), aor. pass. *ἐλήμφθην* etc., § 7, 23—25: perf. pass. regular *κατειλημμένος* (variously spelt) Est. C. 12, 2 M. xv. 19: terminations *ἔλαβαν*, § 17, 2, *ἐλάμβαναν* Cod. A, § 17, 4, *ἐλάβοσαν ἐλαμβάνοσαν*, § 17, 5: double aug. *ἐκατέλαβεν* Cod. A, § 16, 8: verb adj. *ἀναλημπτέος*, § 15, 2.

Λανθάνω: term. *ἐπελάθεντο* (for *-οντο*), § 17, 10.

(**Λέγω** "collect") in comp. with *ἐκ-* (mid. verb only[3]), *ἐπισυν- ἀπ-* Jdth x. 17 B*ℵ*: perf. pass. (Att. usually *-είλεγμαι*) in mid. sense *ἐκλέλεκται* (N. xvi. 7 B[ab]), 1 K. x. 24, but part. in pass. sense *ἐκλελεγμένη* 1 M. vi. 35, *ἐπιλελεγμ.* ib. xii. 41, so plpf. *συνελέλεκτο* Jdth iv. 3: *-λέξω* (*-ομαι*) *-έλεξα* (*-άμην*) and aor. pass. *ἐκλεγέντες* 1 Ch. xvi. 41 etc., *συλλεγέντων* 3 M. i. 21 are class.

Λέγω "say" is defective in LXX as in N.T., being used only in pres. and impf. of the act. (terminations *ἐλέγαμεν ℵ*, § 17, 4, *ἐλέγοσαν* A, § 17, 5) and, more rarely, of the passive, with two exceptions in literary books: (*ἐξ*)*ἐλεξεν* 3 M. vi. 29, *λεχθέντα*[4] Est. i. 18: *λέξω λέλεγμαι* etc. are not used. The other tenses

[1] Also an incorrect reading of A in Sir. xvi. 12.

[2] From perf. act. *ἀπέκτακα* which occurs in Polyb.

[3] Except *ἐκλέξω* Ez. xx. 38 AQ (read *ἐλέγξω* B), *ἐξέλεξα* 1 M. xi. 23 ℵ (read *ἐπ-* AV).

[4] ελεχθη L. vi. 5 B stands for *ἐλεγχθῇ*.

are supplied (as also to some extent in Attic) by aor. *εἶπον*[1] (or *εἶπα*, § 17, 2, 3rd plur. *εἶποσαν*, § 17, 5, opt. *εἴπαισαν -οισαν*, § 17, 7), fut. *ἐρῶ*, pf. *εἴρηκα* (sometimes equivalent to aorist *εἶπον*, 1 K. xx. 26 B, 4 K. vi. 7 B), and pass. *ῥηθήσομαι* N. xxiii. 23, Sir. xv. 10, 1 M. xiv. 44 (*-σόμενος*), *εἴρημαι* Prov. xxiv. 69, 1 M. xiv. 22, 2 M. vi. 17 (*εἰρήσθω*), 4 M. i. 33 (*ἀπειρημένος*) and *ἐρρέθην* (for Att. *-ήθην*) *ῥηθῆναι ῥηθείς*, §§ 18, 1: 6, 16. Cf. *διαλέγομαι*.

Λείπω (the *simplex* only in literary books) has the alternative pres. form *δια- ἐγκατα- ἐκ- κατα-* **λιμπάνω**, once in A *καταλειμμάνειν*, § 19, 3: aor. act. usually *ἔλιπον*, rarely the late *ἔλειψα*, § 21, 1: aor. pass. usually *ἐλείφθην*, once in 2 Es. B. the late *κατελίπησαν*, § 21, 4: the increasing disuse of the *o* aorist shows itself also in the constant reading of A etc. *-έλειπον ὑπελειπόμην* for *-έλιπον -ελιπόμην* of B: other tenses regular: terminations *ἐγκατέλιπαν*, § 17, 2, *ἐλίποσαν*, § 17, 5, *κατέλειπαν* Cod. A, § 17, 4.

Λευκαίνω "make white" and "be white" L. xiii. 19 (Aristot.): aor. *ἐλεύκᾱνα*, § 18, 4: fut. pass. *λευκανθήσομαι* Ψ l. 9. A synonym is **λευκαθίζω** (for *λευκανθίζω* Hdt. VIII. 27), L. xiii. 38 f. with pf. pass. *λελευκαθισμένη* Cant. viii. 5 B (*-ανθ.* ℵA).

Λογίζομαι: tenses regular *λογιοῦμαι* (*λογίσεται* L. vii. 8 A for *λογισθήσεται* BF) *ἐλογισάμην*, and with pass. sense *ἐλογίσθην λελόγισμαι* (A once without redupl. *λογισμένον*, § 16, 7): new fut. pass. *λογισθήσομαι* (*συλ-*) is frequent.

Λούω: *ἐλούσθην*, *λέλουσμαι* (Att. tenses without *σ*), § 18, 2: A writes Attic *λουμένην* in the only passage where the pres. mid. is used, 2 K. xi. 2, B *λουομένην*.

Λυμαίνομαι, often written *λοιμαίνομαι*, § 6, 41: aor. *ἐλυμηνάμην* (as in Att.: not *ἐλυμαν.*), § 18, 4.

Λύω: term. *κατελύοσαν*, § 17, 5: double aug. *ἐδιελύσαμεν* Cod. ℵ, § 16, 8.

Μακρύνω: used in a few, mainly late, books, esp. Ψ, both transitively=*μακρὰν ἀφιστάναι* (so pf. pass. in Aristot.) and intr. =*μακρὰν ἀπέχειν* e.g. Jd. xviii. 22 or="delay" Jdth ii. 13: pf. act. *μαμακρυνκότων* A, § 16, 7: pf. pass. *μεμακρυμμένου*, § 18, 4.

Μαρτύρομαι (*δια- ἐπι-*): fut. (not attested before LXX) *διαμαρτυροῦμαι* Ex. xviii. 20 etc.: *μεμαρτύρω* 2 Es. xix. 34 B, § 16, 7.

Μάχομαι: fut. (no ex. of simple fut.) *διαμαχήσομαι* Sir. xxxviii. 28 (so with *-μαχέσομαι* in Ionic and late Greek), § 20, 2: aor. regular *ἐμαχεσάμην* (not the late *ἐμαχέσθην*), § 21, 6. As from **-μαχίζομαι** (unrecorded in LS) *διαμεμάχισται* Sir. li. 19.

Μείγνυμι: for pres. and impf. act. *(συμ)μίσγω συνέμισγον* are used (*συνμίσσει* Cod. A, § 9, 5), so *συναναμίσγεσθε* Ez. xx. 18 B^{corr} (*-μίγγεσθε* B* *sic*, *-μίγνυσθαι* AQ), whereas the *-μι* forms are

[1] 1st aor. mid. *ἀπειπάμην* (Hdt., Aristot. and late prose) Job vi. 14, x. 3, xix. 18 A and Zech. xi. 12.

usual in the middle, § 23, 2: class. tenses used are *ἔμ(ε)ιξα*, *ἐμ(ε)ίχθην* in mid. sense "make terms" 4 K. xviii. 23 = Is. xxxvi. 8, (*ἐπ*)*εμίγην* Ψ cv. 35, 1 Es. viii. 67, 84, Ez. xvi. 37 (*ἀνα*)*μέμιγμαι* (never *-μέμειγμαι*): 2 fut. pass. *συμμιγήσονται* Dan. Θ xi. 6 (*ἀποσυμ-* A: *μιγήσεσθαι* once in Hom., else late).

Μέλλω: *ἔμελλον* and *ἤμελλον*, § 16, 3.

(**Μέλω**): impers. *μέλει* rare, impers. *μεταμελήσῃ* Ex. xiii. 17: *ἐπιμελοῦμαι* Gen. xliv. 21 (pres. with fut. sense) and *-μέλομαι* are both Attic, § 22, 3, tenses *ἐπιμελήσομαι* and *ἐπεμελήθην* regular: the tenses of *μεταμέλομαι* (Att. only in pres. and impf.) are new viz. *μετεμελήθην*, *μεταμεληθήσομαι*, *-μεμέλημαι*, § 21, 6.

Μερίζω (*δια-*): fut. *μεριῶ* (Att.) with v.l. *-ίσω*, § 20, 1 (i) and fut. mid. *μεριοῦμαι* 1 K. xxx. 24, Prov. xiv. 18: fut. pass. *μερισθήσομαι* N. xxvi. 53 etc. post-classical: else regular.

Μιαίνω: pf. pass. *μεμιαμμένος* (v.l. *-ασμ* as in Att.), § 18, 4.

Μιμνῄσκομαι (*ἐπι-* 1 M. x. 46: the act. is only used in composition with *ἀνα-* *ὑπο-*): the pres. (rare in early prose) = "make mention" Is. xii. 4, xlviii. 1, lxii. 6, = "remember" Ψ viii. 5, Sir. vii. 36, 1 M. vi. 12, xii. 11, with alternative unredupl. form *μνήσκομαι*, § 19, 3: class. tenses with the meaning "remember" *μέμνημαι*, *ἐμεμνήμην* Tob. i. 12, *ἐμνήσθην*, *μνησθήσομαι* (not *μεμνήσομαι*, § 15, 3): the aor. and fut. occasionally have passive meaning "be mentioned" (unclass.), *ἐμνήσθην* Sir. xvi. 17 B, Jer. xi. 19, Ez. iii. 20, xviii. 24, xxxiii. 13 A, 16 A, *μνησθήσομαι* Ez. xviii. 22, Job Θ xxviii. 18.

Μισέω: impf. *ἐμίσων* (for *-ουν*) Cod. ℵ, § 22, 1: post-class. pass. tenses *μεμίσημαι* Is. liv. 6, lx. 15, *μισηθήσομαι* Sir. ix. 18, xx. 8, xxi. 28, Eccl. viii. 1.

Μνηστεύομαι (act. not used) fut. *-σομαι* and perf., with pass. and mid. sense, *μεμνήστευμαι* (*ἐμν.*), § 16, 7.

Μοιχάομαι an alternative form, probably Doric[1] (first found in Xen. *Hell.* 1. 6, 15 in the act. in the mouth of a Lacedaemonian), of the Att. *μοιχεύω*, confined in LXX to two books, Jer. (iii. 8, v. 7, vii. 9, ix. 2, xxiii. 14, xxxvi. 23—all except the last in "Jer. *a*") and Ez. *a* (xvi. 32, xxiii. 37, 43 A), as in N.T. to Mt. and Mc.: it is used only in pres. and impf. (therefore *ἐμοίχευσε* Jer. iii. 9): aug. dropped in *μοιχᾶτο* ℵ, § 16, 2. Elsewhere in LXX and N.T. the tenses of **μοιχεύω** are used, including the pres. (L. xx. 10, Hos. iv. 14, vii. 4, Ez. xxiii. 43 BQ), the class. distinction in the use of the act. of the man, the pass. of the woman, not being rigidly observed.

Μολύνω: perf. pass. *μεμολυμμένος* and *-υσμένος*, § 18, 4: the fut. pass. *μολυνθήσομαι* Sir. xiii. 1 etc. appears to be post-classical.

Νέμω has late sigmatic futures and aorist *νεμήσω*, *-ήσομαι*,

[1] Wackernagel *Hellenistica* 7 ff.

κατενεμησάμην (Att. *νεμῶ -οῦμαι ἐνειμάμην*), § 21, 2: class. aor. act. and pass. retained in Dt. xxix. 26 *διένειμεν*, W. xix. 9 *ἐνεμήθησαν*.

Νήθω[1] vulgar and late form of *νῶ* (= *νάω* or *νήω*), like *ἀλήθω* = *ἀλέω*, Ex. xxxv. 25, with late perf. pass. (*δια*)*νενησμένος*, Ex. xxvi. 31 etc. and verb. adj. *νηστός*, Ex. xxxi. 4 (contrast Epic *ἐΰννητος*): the old aor. *ἔνησα* Ex. xxxv. 26 required no alteration.

Νίπτω, the Ionic present from which the tenses are formed, replaces Att. *νίζω*, § 19, 3: fut. pass. *νιφήσεται* L. xv. 12 has no early authority: pf. pass. with mid. sense *νένιπται* ib. 11 BA (early in comp.): else regular: LXX prefers the simple verb which Attic prose avoided (*ἀπο-* 3 K. xxii. 38, Prov. xxiv. 35, 55: *περι-* Tob vi. 3 ℵ).

Νοέω: 3rd plur. impf. (*κατ*)*ενοοῦσαν*, § 17, 5: the deponent fut. of the compounds always takes the pass. form *ἐννοηθήσομαι* Sir. xiv. 21 ℵA (*νοηθ.* BC), *διανοηθήσομαι* Sir. iii. 29 etc., Dan. O ix. 25 etc. (*διανοήσομαι* is an alternative class. form).

Νομίζω: apart from Sir. xxix. 4 only in literary books: verb. adj. *νομιστέον*, § 15, 2.

Νύσσομαι (*κατα-*): the compound with met. sense "feel compunction" or of lust (Sus. 10) is not found before LXX: for aor. the Pent. uses *κατενύχθην*, the other books *κατενύγην* with fut. *-νυγήσομαι*, § 21, 4: perf. *-νέννυγμαι*.

Νυστάζω: *νυστάξω ἐνύσταξα*, § 18, 3 (i).

(**Ξενόω**): term. *ἀπεξενοῦσαι* Cod. A (from Aquila), § 17, 12.

Ξηραίνω (*ἀνα- ἀπο-*) has late fut. pass. *ξηρανθήσομαι* Is. xix. 5 etc. in addition to class. tenses (no pf. pass. attested).

From **ξυρέω** or the later **ξυράω** (pres. unattested: no forms from *ξύρω* in LXX) LXX besides class. *ἐξύρησα*, *ἐξύρημαι*, has the following regularly formed tenses which lack early authority: *ξυρήσω*, *ἐξυρήθην*, *ξυρηθήσομαι*, *ἐξυρησάμην*, *ξυρήσομαι*.

(**Οϊγω** only in the compounds) **ἀνοίγω**, *διανοίγω*, and once **προσοίγω**: never *-οίγνυμι*: for the spelling *ἀνύγω*, § 6, 41 (i): the augment (§ 16, 6) is always in the *α* in *διανοίγω διήνοιξα* etc. (*διηνέῳκτο* Job xxxi. 32 C is a solitary ex. of augmented *οι*) and usually in *ἀνοίγω*, the compound nature of which is becoming obscured, thus impf. *ἤνοιγον -όμην*, aor. act. and pass. (i) usually *ἤνοιξα ἠνοίχθην*, less commonly (ii) Att. *ἀνέῳξα ἀνεῴχθην* or (iii) with triple aug. *ἠνέῳξα ἠνεῴχθην*: the perf. pass., on the other hand, appears once only in the later form (i) *ἠνοιγμένος* Is. xlii. 20 (*διήνοικται* Job Θ xxix. 19), usually (ii) Att. *ἀνεῳγμένος* or (iii) *ἠνεῳγμένος*, plpf. *ἀνέῳκτο* (*ἠν.*) Job *l.c.*: the 2nd perf. act. *ἀνέῳγα* once with intrans. sense Tob. ii. 10 BA: 2 Es. has late 2nd aor. and fut. pass. *ἠνοίγην*, *ἀνοιγήσομαι*, the other books 1st aor. in

[1] See Rutherford *NP* 134 ff.

-χθην with fut. *ἀνοιχθήσομαι*, also late (Xen. *ἀνεῴξομαι*), § 21, 4. *Προσέῳξεν* Gen. xix. 6 is a new compound, rather strangely used as the opposite of *ἀνέῳξεν*="*shut* to" (Heb. סָגַר, rendered *ἀπέκλεισαν* in *v.* 10: cf. German *zumachen*, *aufmachen*).

Οἶδα in LXX, as in Hellenistic Greek generally, has the uniform conjugation *οἴδας* (27 exx.) *-ε -αμεν -ατε -ασι(ν)*. The Attic forms are now an index of literary style: 2 sing. *οἶσθα* 4 M. vi. 27 and in the degenerate form[1] *οἴσθας* Dt. ix. 2 B (*οἶσθα* F, *ἦσθα* A): plur. *ἴστε* 3 M. iii. 14 (a letter of Ptolemy), *εἴσασιν* Job xxxii. 9 ℵ$^{c.a}$ (ειcιν ℵ*: the translator, notwithstanding his usual classical style, no doubt wrote *οἴδασιν* here as elsewhere). For 2 sing. *οἶδες* in A (perhaps influenced by *εἶδες*: so in later papyri from ii/A.D., Mayser 321) cf. § 17, 8. The plpf. is also uniform, keeping *ει* throughout: *ᾔδειν* (*εἴδην* 2 K. i. 10 B* may have arisen out of the 3rd plur. 1st aor. *εἴδησαν*), *ᾔδεις* (Dt. xiii. 6) *-ει -ειμεν -ειτε -εισαν*: the classical forms *ᾔδη ᾔδησθα* (*-ης*) *ᾔδεμεν* (*ᾖσμεν*) etc. being unrepresented. Inf. *εἰδέναι*, part. *εἰδώς*[2].

The only fut. in LXX (*εἴσομαι* is not found) is *εἰδήσω* (Ionic, Aristotle and late writers) in Jer. xxxviii. 34 *εἰδήσουσιν*[3] ℵQ (*οἰδήσουσιν* B, *ἰδήσουσιν* A). A corresponding 1st aor. *εἴδησα* strictly="came to know" (Ionic and from Aristotle onwards: *εἰδῆσαι* in a papyrus of iii/B.C., Mayser 370) occurs in the B text of Deut.: *εἴδησαν* viii. 3, 16, xxxii. 17^{b}, AF reading *ᾔδεισαν* in each case (cf. Is. xxvi. 11 Γ), with inf. *εἰδῆσαι* Dt. iv. 35 B (*εἰδέναι* AF), Jdth ix. 14 Bℵ*A.

There is constant confusion in the MSS between the forms of *οἶδα* and *εἶδον*, esp. the participles *εἰδώς* and *ἰδών* (cf. note 2 below). The existence of a genuine variant form *εἰδών* as part. of *οἶδα* can hardly be inferred from the evidence: it occurs in 2 Es. xx. 28 A, Job xix. 14 B*ℵ$^{c.a}$, Wis. iv. 14 ℵ, with *συνειδ(ών)* 1 M. iv. 21 ℵV*^{vid}, 2 M. iv. 41 V*. A good illustration of the confusion of forms is Job xx. 7 (Heb. "see"): *εἰδότες* B, *ἰδότες* A, *ἰδόντες* ℵ, *εἰδότες ἰδόντες* (conflate) C.

Οἰκέω: aug. omitted in *κατοίκησα*, § 16, 4.

Οἰκίζω: aug. omitted in *κατοίκισα*, § 16, 4.

Οἰκοδομέω: aug. omitted in *οἰκοδόμησα*, § 16, 4, retained in part. *ᾠκοδομήσαντες*, § 16, 9: 3rd pl. impf. *ᾠκοδομοῦσαν*, § 17, 5.

Οἰκτείρω: so always in B and usually in the other uncials (Inscriptions show that *οἰκτίρω* was the older form, and so ℵ generally writes, but its testimony is untrustworthy, cf. § 6, 24): fut. and aor. take the late forms (as from *-έω*, cf. *οἰκτείρημα*

[1] Rutherford *NP* 227 f.

[2] Or *ἰδώς*: so A writes in Job xix. 19, xx. 7, xxviii. 24, Eccl. ix. 1 and (with ℵ) W. ix. 9: B* has this spelling in Bar. iii. 32 only (Bar. *β*, p. 13).

[3] The reading is supported by the quotation in Hebrews viii. 11.

Jer. xxxviii. 3) *οἰκτειρήσω*, *οἰκτείρησα* (never *ᾠκτ.*, § 16, 4): the class. aor. *ᾤκτειρα* (*οἴκτ.*) is now literary 2 M. viii. 2, 3 M. v. 51, and in comp. with *κατ-* 4 M. viii. 20 ℵ, xii. 2 ℵV (A twice correcting to the later form), with *ἐπ-* Job xxiv. 21 A: the writer of 4 M. employs the unclass. mid. *οἰκτείρομαι* v. 33 (*-ήσω* A), viii. 10.

Οἶμαι 4 M. i. 33 (rare outside literary books), 2 sg. *οἴει* and *οἴῃ*, § 17, 12, has the Attic tenses *ᾠμην* (not *ᾠόμην*) Gen. xxxvii. 7 etc., *ᾠήθην* Est. E. 14 (ηθη ℵ*, ωηθει A), 1 M. vi. 43 ℵ. The late compound *κατοιόμενος* "supercilious" occurs in Hb. ii. 5 (Aristeas § 122, Philo).

Οἰμώζω: fut. *οἰμώξω* (Att. *-ξομαι*), § 20, 3.

(**Οἰστράω**) only in the late compound *παροιστράω* intrans. "rage," Hos. iv. 16 *παροιστρῶσα παροίστρησεν* (aug., § 16, 4: *παροίστρωσεν* Q*vid), Ez. ii. 6 *-ήσουσι(ν)*.

"**Ολλυμι** *ἀπ-δι-ἐξ-προσαπ-*: forms as from *-ολλύω* in the active § 23, 2: the simple vb, confined in early Greek to poetry, in LXX is limited to Job, Prov. (both of which imitate the poets) and Jer. *β* (also Jer. x. 20 *ὤλετο* a doublet): tenses regular including fut. *ἀπολῶ -οῦμαι*, whereas *ἀπολέσω* (N.T.) hardly belongs to LXX proper, § 20, 1 (iv): *ἀπόλωλα* is frequent, the trans. pf. *ἀπολώλεκα* rare and with one exception confined to the part., Dt. xxxii. 28, Is. xlvi. 12, xlix. 20 (*ἀπώλεκας* A, § 16, 7), Sir. ii. 14, viii. 12, xxix. 14, xli. 2: term. of aor. opt. *ὀλέσαισαν* etc., § 17, 7. The Job translator also uses the collateral Epic form **ὀλέκω**, x. 16, xvii. 1, xxxii. 18.

Ὀλολύζω: fut. *ὀλολύξω* (Att. *-ξομαι*), § 20, 3.

"**Ομνυμι** (*ἐξόμνυμαι* in 4 M.) and usually **ὀμνύω**, but the *-μι* forms remain in the mid., § 23, 2: fut. *ὀμοῦμαι* (not the later *ὀμύσω*), § 20, 1 (iv): perf. *ὀμώμοκα* appears in degenerate forms, § 16, 7: aor. regular *ὤμοσα*, the aug. being retained in part. *ὠμόσαντες*, § 16, 9, aor. mid. only in 4 M. ix. 23 *ἐξομόσησθε*.

Ὁμοιόω: aug. omitted in aor. *ὁμοίωσα*, § 16, 4: tenses regular.

(**Ὀνίνημι**): represented only by the class. fut. mid. *ὀνήσεται* Sir. xxx. 2 and the unclass. 1 aor. pass. *ὠνάσθης*, § 18, 2.

Ὀξύνω (*παρ-*): aug. omitted in *παροξύνθην*, § 16, 4: no perf. act. or pass. attested, other tenses regular, the fut. pass. *παροξυνθήσομαι* Dan. O xi. 10 occurring already in Hippocrates.

Ὁράω retains most of the class. forms including pres. and imperf., though the latter is rare and both tenses are beginning to be replaced by means of *βλέπω* and *θεωρῶ* q.v.: fut. *ὄψομαι* (*ὄψ.*, § 8, 3 (3)) with 2nd sg. *-ῃ* and *-ει*, § 17, 12: pf. *ἑώρακα ἑόρακα*, § 16, 6, 3rd pl. *ἑώρακαν*, § 17, 3: aor. *εἶδον* or *ἴδον*, § 16, 5 (*ἴδ.*, § 8, 3 (3)), 3rd pl. *εἶδαν* (*ἴδ.*) and *(ε)ἴδοσαν*, § 17, 2 and 5, aug. retained in moods *εἴδῃ* etc., § 16, 9. In the passive the class. aor. and fut. *ὤφθην*, *ὀφθήσομαι* are frequent: the aor. *ἐωράθην* (not before Aristot.) occurs in Prov. xxvi. 19 Bℵ* (*ὁραθῶσιν*), Ez. xii. 12 (*ὁραθῇ*), xxi. 24 (*ὁραθῆναι*) and in the form *ὡράθησαν* in Dan. Θ

i. 15, § 16, 6: fut. *ὁραθήσομαι* is late and confined to Job Θ xxii. 14 and in compos. with *παρ-* 3 M. iii. 9 (the comp. occurs in a papyrus of 113 B.C., Mayser 405: Galen, a contemporary of Θ, is the earliest authority for this fut. in the *simplex*): Att. pf. pass. *ὦπται* occurs in Ex. iii. 16, iv. 1, 5, Jd. xiii. 10 BA, elsewhere the rather later *ἑώραμαι* (Isocr.) or *ἑόρ.*, § 16, 6. The only examples noted of pres. mid. (pass.) are literary, *ὁρώμενος* (pass.) W. xiii. 1, *ὑφορώμενος* (mid.) 2 M. vii. 24, 3 M. iii. 23, of impf. mid. *προορώμην* Ψ xv. 8. On the other hand two new pres. forms for "I am seen" occur, **ὀπτάζομαι** N. xiv. 14 and **ὀπτάνομαι** (*ὠπτανόμην*) 3 K. viii. 8, Tob. xii. 19 BA (the latter in papyri of ii/B.C., Mayser 404, and in N.T.).

Ὀργίζομαι, παροργίζω: "provoke to anger" is expressed by the late compound *παροργίζω -ιῶ -ὠργισα*, which appears twice only in the pass. (Theophr.), *παροργισμένην* Sir. iv. 3 (*-ωργ.*), § 16, 4, *παροργισθήσεται* Dan. O xi. 36: *ὀργίζομαι* on the other hand is confined to the passive[1], with tenses *ὠργίσθην*, *ὀργισθήσομαι* (never the more frequent Att. *ὀργιοῦμαι*), § 21, 7.

Ὀρθόω: aug. in *ἀν-κατ-ορθώθην*, § 16, 4, *ἐπανωρθώθην*, ib. 8.

Ὀρθρίζω "rise early" (*δι-* 1 K. xxix. 10 A), often written *ὀρθίζω*, § 7, 35, replaces the earlier **ὀρθρεύω**, found only in Tob. ix. 6 B: fut. *ὀρθριῶ* with v.l. *-ίσω*, § 20, 1 (i), aor. *ὤρθρισα*.

Ὀρύσσω (*δι- κατ-*): 2 aor. pass. (late) *κατωρύγην*, the earlier 1 aor. *-ωρύχθην* once in A, § 21, 4.

Ὀφείλω: fut. *ὀφειλήσω* (Att.) and *-έσω*, § 18, 1: 2 aor. now only in unaugmented form *ὄφελον* as particle, § 16, 4.

Παίζω (*ἐμ-κατα-προσ-συμ-*) has the late guttural tenses *-παίξομαι* (and *-ξω*, § 20, 3), *ἔπαιξα*, *-πέπαιχα*, *-πέπαιγμαι*, § 18, 3 (i) (for Att. *παίσομαι* etc., Rutherford *NP* 91, 313 f.).

Παίω: see *τύπτω*.

Παροιμιάζω: aug. *παροιμίαζεν*, *ἐπαρ.*, § 16, 2 and 8.

Πάσσω "sprinkle," used in the *simplex* (poetical) and compounded with *κατα-*, has the late tenses *πεπασμένος* Est. i. 6 and aor. mid. *κατ-επασάμην*.

Πατάσσω: see *τύπτω*.

Πατέω: *πατῶσιν* Cod. A for *πατοῦσιν*, § 22, 1: double aug. *ἐνεπεριεπάτησα* Cod. A, § 16, 8.

Παύω (*ἀνα- ἐπανα- κατα-*): the *simplex* is almost confined to the mid., *καταπαύω* almost to the act. which is used both transitively and intransitively, e.g. *τῇ ἡμ. τῇ ἑβδ. κατέπαυσεν καὶ ἐπαύσατο* Ex. xxxi. 17: tenses regular, in pass. and mid. *παύσομαι* (not *παυ(σ)θήσομαι* nor the late *παήσομαι*), *ἐπαυσάμην* with *ἀνε-*

[1] A has the act. twice, but *ὀργίζει* Prov. xvi. 30 is an error for *ὁρίζει* and *ὅσοι γὰρ ὀργίζουσιν* Job xii. 6 for *ὅσοι παροργίζουσιν*.

παύθημεν Lam. v. 5, *πέπαυμαι* : under the influence of the Heb. *ἀναπαύειν, καταπαύειν τινί*="give rest to" 3 K. v. 4, 1 Ch. xxiii. 25, 2 Ch. xiv. 6, xv. 15, xx. 30.

Πείθω (*ἀνα-, συμ-*) is mainly restricted to the 2nd perf. **πέποιθα** (rare in Attic prose) with pres. sense "I trust," 3rd plur. *πέποιθαν*, § 17, 3, and plpf. *ἐπεποίθειν* (*πεπ.*, § 16, 2) : the paraphrastic construction of *πεποιθώς* with auxiliary *εἶναι* (or *γίνεσθαι* Is. xxx. 12, Sir. ii. 5 ℵ$^{c.a}$) is frequent, especially in Is., *π. εἶ* Is. xxxvi. 4, 6, xxxvii. 10 (*πέποιθας* B), *π. ᾗς* and *ὦσιν* ib. viii. 14, x. 20, xvii. 8, *ἴσθι π.* Prov. iii. 5, *π. ἦν*, fut. *π. ἔσομαι* 2 K. xxii. 3, Job xi. 18 and 10 times in Is. : so much has *πέποιθα* come to be regarded as a pres. that a new 1st aor. **ἐπεποίθησα** is formed from it, § 19, 1, cf. *πεποίθησις* 4 K. xviii. 19. The remaining tenses of the verb in LXX (*πείσω, ἔπεισα, πείθομαι, ἐπειθόμην, πέπεισμαι, ἐπείσθην*) are with few exceptions restricted to the literary books.

Πεινάω has *α* for Att. *η* in the contracted forms, § 22, 2, and in the tenses *πεινᾶσω ἐπείνᾶσα*, § 18, 1.

Πειράομαι (*ἀπο-*), **πειράζω** (*δια- ἐκ-*) : the former is used for "attempt (anything)" with passive tenses *ἐπειράθην* and *πεπείραμαι* with mid. sense (class.), the latter for "tempt" or "try (anyone)" with pass. aor. *ἐπειράσθην* "be tried," § 18, 2.

Περισσεύω has the new meanings "be excessive" or "severe" to anyone (Sir. xxx. 38) and "be superior to" "excel" (Eccl. iii. 19), but is not yet found in causative sense (as in N.T.)="make to abound" : aug. regular *ἐπερίσσευσα*, § 16, 8.

(**Πετάζω**) *ἐκ-* replaces **πετάννυμι** "spread out" in the only two passages where a pres. occurs § 23, 2 : aor. *ἐπέτασα* (*ἀνα- δι- ἐξ-*) is Attic, and fut. *ἐκπετάσω* is old (Att. *πετῶ*) : pf. act. *διαπεπετακότα* 2 Ch. v. 8 is post-class. and pf. pass. *διαπεπετασμένος* (3 K., 1—2 Ch.) replaces Att. *-πέπταμαι*, § 18, 2.

Πέτομαι, πέταμαι (*πετάομαι*), *ἵπταμαι* "fly" : (i) Attic *πέτομαι* occurs in pres. ind. *πέτονται* Job v. 7, Is. lx. 8 Bℵ and part. *πετόμενος* (9 exx.) with impf. *ἐπέτοντο* Is. vi. 2 ℵ : (ii) *πέταμαι* (poetical and late prose) in pres. ind. *πέτα(ν)ται* Dt. iv. 17, Prov. xxvi. 2, Is. lx. 8 AQ, part. *πετάμενος* Is. xiv. 29 B (*-όμενος* cett.), inf. *πέτασθαι* (?*-ᾶσθαι*) Ez. xxxii. 10 BQ, impf. *ἐπέταντο* Is. vi. 2 BAQΓ[1] : (iii) the aor. and fut. in LXX are the late passive forms (as from *πετάζω*) *ἐπετάσθην* (*ἐξ- κατ-*), *πετασθήσομαι*[2] (*vice* class. *ἐπτόμην, πτήσομαι*), § 18, 2 : (iv) of the later *πετάομαι* a possible ex. occurs in Ez. *l.c.* : *πετώμενος* Zech. v. 1 Γ* may be a mere itacism for *-όμενος* : (v) as from *ἵπτημι -αμαι*

[1] *Ἐπέτατο* W. xvii. 21 BA is doubtless a corruption of *ἐπετέτατο* (*τείνω*).

[2] These forms appear in Hatch-Redpath s.v. *πεταννύναι, πετάζειν*, but with one possible exception the meaning is "fly" (Heb. עוף). See Rutherford *NP* 373 f. for the mixture of forms.

we have the late pres. act. *διπτάντος* W. v. 11 B* (*διαπτάντος* cett.) and late pres. mid. *ἀν-καθ-ιπτάμενος* Is. xvi. 2, Sir. xliii. 17, *ἐξίπτασθαι* Prov. vii. 10, as well as aor. *ἔπτην* (class. poetry) Job xx. 8 (beside *ἐκπετασθέν* in same *v.*), *ἐξέπτησαν* Sir. xliii. 14[1].

Πιέζω is used, as in Att., for "press" and *ἐκπιέζω* for "oppress" with regular tenses *πιέσω ἐξεπίεσα ἐκπεπίεσμαι*: the later contract form **πιεζέω** in *ἐκπιεζοῦντες* Ez. xxii. 29 B, § 22, 3: **πιάζω** (Doric and colloquial, mod. Gr. *πιάνω*) meaning "seize" occurs in aor. *πιάσατε* Cant. ii. 15 and fut. pass. *πιασθήσομαι* (else unattested) Sir. xxiii. 21 B**א**: but the distinction of meaning is not always observed, *ἐξεπίασεν* Jd. vi. 38 B (*ἀπεπίασεν* A) being used = "pressed out" and *ἐξεπίασα* 1 K. xii. 3 A (*-ίεσα* B) = "oppressed."

Πίμπλημι and **πιμπλάω** (*ἐμ-*), § 23, 4.

(**Πι(μ)πράω**) *ἐμ-* for *ἐμπίπρημι*, § 23, 4.

Πίνω: fut. 2nd sing. *πίεσαι* (not *πίῃ*), § 17, 12: 3rd plur. aor. *ἐπίοσαν*, § 17, 5, imperat. *πίε* (Att. also *πῖθι*), inf. *πιεῖν* and *πεῖν* (*πῖν*), § 5 p. 64: aug. omitted in *πεπώκει*, § 16, 2.

(**Πιπράσκω**) has the class. tenses *πέπρακα* (3rd plur. *πέπρακαν*, § 17, 3), *πέπραμαι* 3 K. xx. 20, 2 M. viii. 14, *ἐπράθην*, with the post-class. fut. pass. *πραθήσομαι* L. xxv. 23 etc.: the other tenses are still, as in Att., supplied from other verbs, pres. and impf. from *πωλέω*, aor. and fut. from *ἀποδίδομαι*.

Πίπτω: aor. usually *ἔπεσα*, not *-ον*, § 17, 2: aug. omitted in plpf. *-πεπτώκειν*, § 16, 2.

Πλανάομαι: fut. *πλανηθήσομαι* for Att. *πλανήσομαι*, § 21, 7.

Πληθύνω (pres. pass. twice in Aeschylus="receive the support of the *πλῆθος*") is frequent in LXX as causative of Att. **πληθύω** "abound" (the latter only in 3 M. v. 41, vi. 4 V): tenses regularly formed including *ἐπληθύνθην*, *πληθυνθήσομαι*, *πεπλήθυμμαι*, § 18, 4: the verb is used intransitively in 1 K. i. 12 (*ἐπλήθυνεν προσευχομένη*), vii. 2, xiv. 19.

Πληρόω: plpf. pass. *ἐπεπλήρωτο* (*πεπλήρωτο* V), § 16, 2, also in Cod. A *ἐπλήρωτο*, § 16, 7, and *ἐπεπληροῦτο*, § 22, 4.

Πλήσσω: see *τύπτω*.

Πλουτίζω: fut. *πλουτιῶ* (Att.) with v.l. *-ίσω*, § 20, 1 (i).

Πνέω: fut. *πνεύσομαι* (Att. in compounds) and *πνεύσω*, the latter once apparently causatively "make to blow," § 20, 3.

(**Ποδίζω**): fut. *συμποδιῶ* with v.l. *-ίσω*, § 20, 1 (i).

Ποθέω, *ἐπι-*: aor. *ἐπόθησα* (Att. also *-εσα*), § 18, 1.

Ποιέω: spellings in **א** *πιήσατε*, *ποῆσε*, § 6, 36 and 38: aug. omitted in *πεποιήκειν*, § 16, 2: terminations *πεποίηκαν*, § 17, 3, *ἐποιοῦσαν*, § 17, 5.

[1] The Heb. corroborates *ἐκστήσονται* in Hos. xi. 11 (cf. 10), *ἐξήφθησαν* in Lam. iv. 19: *ἐκπτήσονται*, *ἐξέπτησαν* were natural corrections suggested by the context.

Πολεμέω: term. *ἐπολεμοῦσαν*, § 17, 5: aor. pass. *ἐπολεμήθησαν* (class., Thuc. v. 26) Jd. v. 20 A "were fought against," fut. pass. late (Polyb.) *πολεμηθήσεται* Dan. o ix. 26: the late fut. and aor. mid. (cited by Veitch from LXX) do not occur in the uncials.

Πονέω: *πονέσω*, *ἐπόνεσα*, § 18, 1.

(**Ποντίζω**): fut. *καταποντιῶ* with v.l. *-ίσω*, § 20, 1 (i).

Πορεύομαι has regular tenses *πορεύσομαι ἐπορεύθην πεπόρευμαι* (the last, including compounds *εἰσ- ἐκ-*, not frequent, mainly in Hex.): the rare *πορευθήσομαι* in late versions, § 21, 7: late 1 aor. mid. *ἐπιπορευσαμένη* 3 M. i. 4 and as v.l. *πορευσώμεθα* Gen. xxxiii. 12 M curs., *πορεύσησθε* L. xxvi. 27 A, *-σώμεθα* 1 M. ii. 20 A.

(**Πρίαμαι**): *ἐπριάμην*, the class. aor. to *ὠνέομαι*, is still retained in Gen. and Prov. xxix. 34: the later *ὠνησάμην* (*ἐων.*) is not used: the form *πριάσασθαι* Gen. xlii. 10 A is unparalleled. "To buy" is now usually *ἀγοράζειν*.

Προνομεύω post-class.: *ἐπρονόμευσα* (with v.l. *προεν.*) and *πεπρονομευμένος*, § 16, 8.

Προφητεύω: aug. *ἐπροφήτευσα* (with v.l. *προεφ.*), § 16, 8: A once has the mid. *ἐπροφητεύοντο* Jer. ii. 8.

Πτοέω: *πτοῶνται* = *-οῦνται*, § 22, 1.

(**Πυρίζω**) *ἐμ-*: a late alternative for *ἐμπίπρημι* or *ἐμπυρεύω*: pf. pass. *ἐμπεπύρισμαι* and in Cod. A *ἐνεπυρισμένος*, § 16, 7.

Ῥαίνω "sprinkle" (class. poetry) has fut. *ῥανῶ*, aor. *ἔρανα* (*ἐπ- προσ-*: class. *ἔρρανα*): pf. *διέρραγκα* is new, § 16, 7 note. Cod. A once has fut. *ῥανιεῖ* L. xiv. 16 as from **ῥανίζω** (Pollux). The aor. pass. *ἐραντίσθην* (*ἐπ- περι-*) is formed from the post-class. **ῥαντίζω** (Athenaeus is the earliest non-Biblical authority cited), which also has fut. act. *ῥαντιῶ* Ψ l. 9, Ez. xliii. 20 A (*περι-*).

Ῥέω has classical tenses (except for the occasional omission of the second *ρ*): impf. *κατέρρει* 1 K. xxi. 13 (*-έρει* A), *περιέρεον* 4 M. ix. 20, impf. pass. *κατερρεῖτο* ib. vi. 6: fut. *ῥύήσομαι* (*ἀπο- ἐκ-*: not the rarer *ῥεύσομαι* nor the late *ῥεύσω*), § 20, 3: aor. pass. as active *ἐρρύην* (*ἀπ- δι-*), § 21, 3, but *ἐξερύην*, § 7, 39 (not *ἔρρευσα*): pf. *κατερρύηκα* Jer. viii. 13.

The *-μι* forms of **ῥήγνυμι** (*δια- κατα-*) appear only in the pass., for pres. act. **ῥήσσω** is used, § 23, 2: regular tenses *ῥήξω*, *ἔρρηξα*, *ἐρράγην* (for *-ρρ-* and *-ρ-*, § 7, 39): post-class. pf. *διερρηχώς* in "K. βδ" (2 K. xiv. 30, xv. 32, 4 K. xviii. 37), 1 M. v. 14, xiii. 45, Jer. xlviii. 5 AQ: the class. 2nd perf. (intr.) *ἔρρωγα* (*δι- κατ-*) in Jos. ix. 4, 13, 2 K. i. 2 B, Ep. J. 30, also in the form *ἔρρηγα* (*δι- κατ-*: Doric and late) 1 K. iv. 12, 2 K. i. 2 A, Job xxxii. 19: with the same sense the rare pf. pass. *διερρηγμένος* 1 Es. viii. 70, Prov. xxiii. 21 and with mid. sense Jer. xlviii. 5 B**א**: fut. pass. *ῥαγήσομαι* (*ἀπο- δια-*) is late, Is. lviii. 8, Ez. xiii. 11, xxxviii. 20, Hos. xiv. 1, Hb. iii. 10, Eccl. iv. 12.

Ῥίπτω and **ῥιπτέω** (both Attic) both occur in LXX, § 22, 3: pf. act. (class. *ἔρριφα*) only in Jos. xxiii. 4 *ἐπέριφα* A, corrupted in B to *ὅπερ εἶπα*: pf. pass. *ἔρ(ρ)ιμμαι* (*-έρριμαι*, § 7, 40) and *ῥέριμμαι*, § 16, 7: aor. and fut. pass. *ἐρ(ρ)ίφην*, *ῥιφήσομαι* (not *ἐρρίφθην*, *ῥιφθ.*), § 21, 4: term. *ὑπερίπτοσαν*, § 17, 5: for *-ρρ-* and *-ρ-*, § 7, 39.

Ῥύομαι (early in poetry, cf. *ἐρύομαι*) is common in LXX (esp. in Ψ and Is.) having, besides the class. tenses *ῥύσομαι*, *ἐρ(ρ)υσάμην*, in certain books (4 K., Ψ, 1 M.) two late pass. tenses with pass. meaning *ἐρ(ρ)ύσθην*, *ῥυσθήσομαι*, § 21, 5: for *-ρρ-* and *-ρ-*, § 7, 39.

Σαλπίζω: new fut. *σαλπιῶ* and *-ίσω*, § 20, 1 (i): aor. *ἐσάλπισα* (for older *-ιγξα* or *-ιξα*), § 18, 3 (ii).

Σβέννυμι (*ἀπο- κατα-*) keeps the *-μι* forms in literary books, which alone use pres. and impf., § 23, 2, and the Att. tenses *σβέσω*, *ἔσβεσα*: the passive tenses are (Ionic and) late, *ἔσβεσμαι* (also Ionic) Is. xliii. 17, Job xxx. 8, 3 M. vi. 34, *ἐσβέσθην* (Ion.) Job iv. 10 etc. with v.ll. *ἐσβήθην σβεν(σ)θέντος*, § 18, 2, *σβεσθήσομαι* L. vi. 9 *et pass.*: the class. *-έσβην -έσβηκα -σβήσομαι* are unrepresented.

Σημαίνω: aor. *ἐσήμανα* and (literary books) *ἐσήμηνα -ηνάμην*, § 18, 4: *σεσήμανται* (class.) 2 M. ii. 1.

Σιγάω: fut. *σιγήσομαι* and *-σω*, § 20, 3.

Σιωπάω: fut. *σιωπήσομαι* and *-σω*, § 20, 3: pf. *σεσιώπηκα* (class.) Job xviii. 3: *σιωπούντων* for *-ώντων* Cod. A, § 22, 1.

(**Σκεδάννυμι**) *simplex* unused, in comp. usually with *δια-* and, mainly in met. sense, also *ἀπο-* 4 M. v. 11, *κατα-* Ex. xxiv. 8: pres. *-μι* form once in pass. *διασκεδάννυται*, for pres. act. **-σκεδάζω** is used, § 23, 2: class. tenses in use *διεσκέδασα -άσθην* Eccl. xii. 5, *-ασμαι* Ex. xxxii. 25, Hb. i. 4, 3 M. v. 30: the futures are post-class., *-σκεδάσω* (Att. *σκεδῶ*), *-σκεδασθήσομαι* Zech. xi. 11, W. ii. 4. Cf. *σκορπίζω*.

Σκεπάζω (*ἐπι-* Lam. iii. 43 f. and the later Versions) "cover," "shelter" (later Attic writers) is frequent with regular tenses including 1 aor. and fut. pass. *ἐσκεπάσθην*, *σκεπασθήσομαι*: **σκέπω** (Ionic and late *κοινή*) is a v.l. of A in Ex. xxvi. 7, Job xxvi. 9.

Σκοπέω, **σκέπτομαι** in Attic form one verb, the pres. and impf. only of the former being used with tenses *σκέψομαι*, *ἐσκεψάμην*. In LXX *σκοπέω* (*ἐπι-*) is rare and confined to the pres.[1], but an aor. *κατεσκόπησα* "spied out" appears in a few passages (the Hexat. to express this sense uses the post-class. **κατασκοπεύω**), § 21, 2. The stem *σκεπτ-* in the *simplex* and in comp. with *κατα-* is, as in Att., restricted to fut. and aor., but **ἐπισκέπτομαι** *συνεπι-* (="review," "inspect," or "visit," "punish": also in pass. apparently "be missed"=פקד niph. e.g. 4 K. x. 19) in addition

[1] Ἐπεσκόπησαν 2 K. ii. 30 B is obviously a slip for *ἐπεσκέπησαν*.

to (i) the class. fut., aor., and perf. *ἐπέσκεμμαι* (used both actively e.g. Ex. iii. 16 "visited" and passively e.g. N. ii. 4 "was reviewed"), is used (ii) in the pres. Ex. xxxii. 34 etc. with by-form **ἐπισκέπομαι** 1 K. xi. 8 B, xv. 4 B (so in a papyrus of iii/B.C., Mayser 351), and (iii) in the late pass. tenses *ἐπεσκέπην ἐπισκεπήσομαι, -εσκέφθην* (Ion.), *-σκεφθήσομαι*, § 21, 4.

Σκορπίζω, *δια-*: "scatter," an Ionic verb according to Phrynichus[1], used by late prose writers from Polybius onwards and in certain portions of LXX, where it has the tenses *σκορπιῶ* and *-ίσω*, § 20, 1 (i), *ἐσκόρπισα, -ίσθην, -ισμαι, σκορπισθήσομαι*. In LXX its distribution[2] and use as a substitute or alternative for *διασπείρειν* in the literal sense of "scatter" are noticeable, while *διασκεδά(ννυμι)* is mainly restricted to metaphorical senses.

Σπάω: tenses regular including pf. mid. and pass. *ἐσπασμένος* (*ἀπ-* etc.), once in B *ἐξεσπαμένος*, § 18, 2, aug. omitted in *ἀποσπασμένοι*, § 16, 2 (no perf. act. used): fut. pass. *ἐκσπασθήσομαι* Am. iii. 12 (*δια-* Xen.): the rare fut. opt. *ἀποσπάσοι* Jd. xvi. 9 B is noteworthy.

Σπείρω (*δια- κατα-*): post-class. tenses are pf. *ἔσπαρκα* Is. xxxvii. 30, fut. pass. *σπαρήσομαι* (with compounds) L. xi. 37, Dt. xxix. 23 etc., Cod. A once using *σπερεῖται* with the same passive meaning N. xx. 5 (*σπείρεται* BF): A also has *διεσπαρσμένους*, § 18, 4: cf. *σκορπίζω*.

Στάζω (poetical word): the fut. *στάξω* Jer. xlix. 18, Eccl. x. 18 B**ℵ** is unrecorded before LXX, *ἔσταξα* is classical.

Στέλλω: terminations *ἐξαπεστέλλοσαν*, § 17, 5, *ἀπέσταλκες* Cod. A, § 17, 8 (not *ἀφέσταλκα*, § 8, 5): tenses regular except that the fut. mid. *δια- ὑπο- στελοῦμαι* (2 Ch. xix. 10, Job xiii. 8, W. vi. 7, Hg. i. 10) lacks early authority.

Στερέω (*ἀπο-*): aor. *ἐστέρησα -ήθην* and *-εσα -έθην*, § 18, 1: *στερηθήσομαι* 4 M. iv. 7 is post-classical: *στέρομαι* is unrepresented, § 22, 3.

Στηρίζω (poetical and late prose): fut. *-ιῶ* and *-ίσω*, § 20, 1 (i): in the other tenses there is fluctuation between *ἐστήρισα* (*-ισάμην*) and *-ιξα, ἐστηρίχθην -ίσθην, -ιγμαι -ισμαι, -ιχθήσομαι -ισθήσομαι*, § 18, 3 (iii).

Στραγγαλάομαι -όομαι v.ll., § 22, 4.

Στρέφω: the *simplex* is trans. only, the compounds of *ἀνα- ἐπι-* etc. trans. and intr., note *διαστρέψεις* intr. 2 K. xxii. 27 A =Ψ xvii. 27 "act perversely": pf. act. unclass. *ἀπεστρόφασιν*

[1] *Σκορπίζεται· Ἑκαταῖος μὲν τοῦτο λέγει Ἴων ὧν, οἱ δ' Ἀττικοὶ σκεδάνυται φασί*: Lobeck p. 218 (cf. Rutherford *NP* 295).

[2] It is absent e.g. from the following portions which use *διασπείρειν* instead: Pent. (except N. x. 35, Dt. xxx. 1, 3 and Gen. xlix. 7 A where read *διασπερῶ*), the earlier portions of the Kingdom books, Is., Jer. *β* and Ez. *β* (except xxviii. 25, xxix. 13), though frequent in Jer. *α* and Ez. *α*.

1 K. vi. 21: pf. pass. regular *-ἔστραμμαι*, the *ε* of the present being retained in *συνεστρεμμένοι* 1 M. xii. 50 A (so in a papyrus of ii/B.C., Mayser 410): aor. pass. *ἐστράφην* (not the rare *ἐστρέφθην*) § 21, 4, with imperat. *ἀπο- ἐπι- στράφητι* (not *-ηθι*) Gen. xvi. 9, N. xxiii. 16 etc., cf. § 7, 13: fut. pass. *στραφήσομαι* (post-class. in the *simplex*) 1 K. x. 6, Sir. vi. 28, Tob. ii. 6, Is. xxxiv. 9 and frequent in the compounds, used both passively and to replace the mid. *-στρέψομαι* (which is not found), e.g. *οὐκ ἀποστραφήσομαι αὐτόν* Am. i. 3 "reject" "turn away from": aor. mid. *ἀπεστρεψάμην* "reject" (post-class. with this prep.) Hos. viii. 3, Zech. x. 6, 3 M. iii. 23.

Στρωννύω (*κατα- ὑπο-*) replaces the older pres. *στόρνυμι*, § 23, 2: the following are post-classical, the futures of the 3 voices *στρώσω* (class. in comp.) Is. xiv. 11, Ez. xxviii. 7, *στρώσομαι* (v. l. *ὑπο-*) Ez. xxvii. 30, *καταστρωθήσομαι* Jdth vii. 14, also aor. mid. *ὑπεστρωσάμην* Is. lviii. 5, aor. pass. *κατεστρώθην* Jdth vii. 25.

Συρίζω: fut. *συριῶ* (in Aquila etc. *συρίσω*: *συρίγξομαι* Lucian): aor. *ἐσύρισα* (for Att. *-ιγξα*), § 18, 3 (ii).

Σύρω: fut. *συρῶ* 2 K. xvii. 13 and aor. mid. *ἀνάσυραι* Is. xlvii. 2 (*-ρε* ℵ) are post-classical.

Σφάλλω has 1 aor. *ἔσφᾶλα* (for Att. *ἔσφηλα*) in Job xviii. 7 opt. *σφάλαι* (σφαλιη A), to which tense should probably also be referred *ἔσφᾶλεν* ib. xxi. 10, Sir. xiii. 22 (εσφαλη A), Am. v. 2 and not to the dubious 2 aor. *ἔσφᾰλον*.

Σφηνόω: *σφηνοίσθω* ℵ, § 22, 3.

Σώζω: perf. pass. *σέσωσμαι*, rarely Att. *σέσωμαι*, but *ἐσώθην*, *σωθήσομαι* as in Att., § 18, 2.

Τάσσω and *τάττω* § 7, 46: the 2nd aor. pass. *-ετάγην* with the fut. *ὑποταγήσομαι* are post-class., the class. 1st aor. *ἐτάχθην* (*προσ- συν-*) being confined to 3 exx. of the neut. part., § 21, 4: the fut. mid. of the *simplex* *τάξομαι* Ex. xxix. 43 "will make an appointment" or "meet" is also late (Mayser 410 gives an ex. of 200 B.C.): pf. act. *τέταχα* is rare, Hb. i. 12, Ez. xxiv. 7 and with *προσ- συν-* in literary books.

Τείνω: the simple pf. act. *τέτακα* Prov. vii. 16 is post-class., cf. *ἐκτέτακα* 1 K. i. 16 (*ἀπο-* is class.): *ἐπέτατο* W. xvii. 21 appears to stand for *ἐπετέτατο* (cf. *πέτομαι*).

Τελέω: fut. *τελέσω*, § 20, 1 (iii): pf. act. only in the periphrastic *ἔσῃ τετελεκώς* Sir. vii. 25: pf. pass. has mid. sense in *συντετέλεσθε* Gen. xliv. 5 and in the *simplex* with the meaning "have oneself initiated" (class.) N. xxv. 5, Hos. iv. 14 (so *ἐτελέσθην* N. xxv. 3=Ψ cv. 28), elsewhere pass. sense: aug. omitted in *τετέλεστο*, § 16, 2: fut. pass. *τελεσθήσομαι* (*ἐπι- συν-*) is late: aor. mid. (rare in class. Gk) *συνετελεσάμην* Is. viii. 8 (*-σαι* A), Jer. vi. 13 Bℵ, 2 M. xiii. 8. For new pres. **τελίσκω**, § 19. 3.

Τίθημι: § 23, 5 and 10: aug. in *παρεκατέθετο*, *ἐσυνέθετο*, § 16, 8.

Τίκτω: fut. *τέξομαι* (not the rarer *τέξω*): 1 aor. pass. *ἐτέχθην* (frequent in LXX.=Att. *ἐγενόμην*) and fut. pass. *τεχθησόμενος* Ψ xxi. 32, lxxvii. 6 are late forms.

Τιμάω: *τιμοῦσιν* ℵ § 22, 1 (as from *-έω*).

Τρέπω *-ομαι* (*ἀνα- ἀπο- ἐν- ἐπι- μετα- προ-*): the only tense at all frequent is the class. 2 aor. pass. *-ετράπην* (imperat. *ἐντράπητι*, § 7, 13), to which is now added the post-class. fut. pass. *τραπήσομαι* Sir. xxxix. 27, *ἐν-* L. xxvi. 41 etc.: the compound with *ἐν-* with the new meaning "be ashamed of" is the commonest form of the verb and is limited to these two tenses with *ἐντέτραμμαι* 1 Es. viii. 71: other parts of the verb are rare outside literary books.

Τρέχω: fut. *δραμοῦμαι* and *δραμῶ*, § 20, 3: no perf. in use: *ἀποτρέχω* now replaces *ἄπειμι*="depart," especially in imperat. *ἀπότρεχε*=*ἄπιθε*, cf. *ἀποτρέχοντες ἀπελεύσονται* Jer. xliv. 9.

Τυγχάνω (literary: *ἀπο- ἐν-* [="entreat" "petition" as in the papyri] *ἐπι- συν-*): the perf. is *τέτευχα* Job vii. 2 (*τετυχηκώς* A), 3 M. v. 35 (so throughout the papyri for Att. *τετύχηκα*, Mayser 374): *ἀντιλήμψεως τεύξασθαι* 2 M. xv. 7=3 M. ii. 33 A (*τεύξεσθαι* V) is an example of the confusion of fut. and aor. forms which is paralleled by *ἔσασθαι*, *παρέξασθαι* etc. in the papyri, cf. § 6, 6 for another example from 2 M.

Τύπτω, as in Attic, is still defective and supplemented by other verbs: some of the latter now appear in non-Attic tenses, but *τύπτω* itself does not extend its range, and the *κοινή*, no less than Attic, affords no excuse to the Byzantine grammarians for their unfortunate selection of this word as typical of the verbal system. (1) *Τύπτω*, *ἔτυπτον* are the only tenses used in LXX with one instance (4 M. vi. 10) of pres. part. pass. (2) The normal fut. and aor. act. are *πατάξω*, *ἐπάταξα*[1], this verb being confined to these tenses, except for the use of pres. inf. **πατάσσειν** in the B text of Jd. xx. 31, 39 (A *τύπτειν*). (3) As aorist, **ἔπαισα** (also Attic, mainly in Tragedy) is preferred by the translator of Job (5 times) and occurs sporadically elsewhere: from this verb we find also pres. conj. once (Ex. xii. 13), pres. part. four times, and perf. *πέπαικα* (post-class. in *simplex*) N. xxii. 28, 1 K. xiii. 4. (4) The passive tenses are formed from **πλήσσειν**: aor. *ἐπλήγην* (*ἐξεπλάγην*, *κατεπλάγην*: *καταπληγείς* 3 M. i. 9 A), fut. *πληγήσομαι*, pf. *πεπληγμένος* (*κατα-*) 3 M. ii. 22 f., but elsewhere *πέπληγα* (rare in earlier Greek and with act. sense) is used with passive meaning, "am struck," N. xxv. 14, 2 K. iv. 4 etc.: the act. of this verb is rare in LXX, pres. (post-class. in *simplex*) *πλήσσουσι* 4 M. xiv. 19 (with *κατα-* in Job), fut. *πλήξω* 3 K. xiv. 14 f. A

[1] See the collocation of pres. and aor. in 1 Es. iv. 8 *εἶπε πατάξαι*, *τύπτουσιν*.

(in an interpolation from Aquila), aor. ἔπληξα 1 K. xi. 11 A (possibly from same source).

Ὑπομνηματίζομαι, a κοινή verb="record," "enter a minute": aug. omitted in ὑπομνημάτιστο § 16, 2.

Ὑστερέω (ἀφ- καθ-): the new features are the fut. ὑστερήσω Ψ xxii. 1, lxxxiii. 12, Job xxxvi. 17 etc., the middle ὑστεροῦμαι Dt. xv. 8 A, Sir. xi. 11, li. 24 B, Cant. vii. 2, and the causative use of the act.="withhold" 2 Es. xix. 21 B* (ὑστέρησαν cett. "they lacked" with MT), so τὸ μάννα σου οὐκ ἀφυστέρησας ib. xix. 20, ἀπαρχὰς .. οὐ καθυστερήσεις Ex. xxii. 29 (cf. 1 Ch. xxvi. 27, Sir. xvi. 13 B).

Ὑφαίνω: aor. ὕφανα (for Att. -ηνα), pf. pass. (Att.) ὑφασμένος, § 18, 4.

Ὑψόω: post-classical verb: inf. ὑψοῖν, § 22, 3.

Φαίνω: 1 aor. act. ἔφᾱνα and (lit.) ἀπέφηνα -ηνάμην, § 18, 4: 1 aor. pass. (rare in class. prose) only in ἐξεφάνθη "was shown" Dan. Θ ii. 19, 30, the Att. 2nd aor. ἐφάνην[1] "appeared" is frequent: fut. φανήσομαι and φανοῦμαι (both Att.), § 15, 3: term. ἐφαίνοσαν, § 17, 5: crasis προυφάνησαν, § 16, 8 note: no form of perf. in LXX. The use of ἐὰν (ἂν) φαίνηταί σοι 1 Es. ii. 18 (cf. 2 Es. vii. 20)=ἐὰν δόξῃ or εἰ δοκεῖ is a standing formula in petitions in the papyri.

Φαύσκω): an Ionic and κοινή verb found only in composition, in LXX with δια- and (3 times in Job) ἐπι-, "dawn" (of daybreak), "give light": LXX has this form of the pres. with aor. διέφαυσα, fut. ἐπιφαύσω Job xxv. 5 A (also φαῦσις and ὑπόφαυσις): the alternative **-φώσκω** (Hdt. and N.T.) -έφωσα only as a variant in Jd. xix. 26 B, 1 K. xiv. 36 A, Job xli. 9 A ἐπιφώσκεται: φαύσκω appears to be the older form, cf. Epic πιφαύσκω.

Φέρω: aor. ἤνεγκα with part. in -ας but inf. -εῖν etc., § 17, 2, once ἀνοίσατε from (Ionic and late) aor. ᾤσα § 21, 2: terminations ἔφεραν, ἐφέροσαν, ἐνέγκαισαν, § 17, 4, 5 and 7: pf. pass. in LXX rare and literary, ἀπενηνεγμένος Est. B. 3 B𝔖, εἰσ- 2 M. xiv. 38 (pf. act. infrequent): fut. pass. (since Aristot.) εἰσενεχθήσομαι Jos. vi. 19, ἀν- Is. xviii. 7, lx. 7, ἀπ- etc.

Φεύγω: terminations ἔφυγα (κατ-) § 17, 2, ἐφύγοσαν § 17, 5: ἐκφεύξασθαι (v.l. -εσθαι) § 6, 6.

Φημί: § 23, 4.

Φθάνω (προ-, κατ- Jd. xx. 42 A) also written **φθάννω**, § 19, 2: impf. ἔφθανεν (rare) Dan. Θ iv. 17 B: fut. φθάσω (not Att. φθήσομαι) § 20, 3: aor. ἔφθασα (Att. also had ἔφθην which is absent from LXX) § 21, 1: pf. ἔφθακα (post-class.) 2 Ch. xxviii.

[1] ΦΑΝΟΙΕΝ 4 M. iv. 23 𝔖V is apparently a corruption of ΦΑΝΕΙΕΝ (ΦΑΝΙΕ A).

9, Cant. ii. 12 (*-σεν* ℵ), *προ-* 1 M. x. 23 A. As regards meaning, the *simplex* retains the original sense of *anticipation* in Wis. (iv. 7, vi. 13, xvi. 28), also in Sir. xxx. 25 (opposed to *ἔσχατος*), cf. 3 K. xii. 18 *ἔφθ. ἀναβῆναι* "made haste": elsewhere (10 times in Dan. Θ, also in the latest group of LXX books, Jd. xx. 34 B etc.)[1] it has its modern meaning "come" or "reach," the sense of priority being lost. "Anticipate" is now expressed by *προφθάνω*, but the *προ-* more often has a local than a temporal force "come into the presence of" or "confront" someone: in Ψ lxvii. 32 it is used causatively, *προφθάσει χεῖρα αὐτῆς τῷ θεῷ* = "eagerly stretch forth."

Φοβέομαι: fut. *φοβηθήσομαι* (Att. *φοβήσομαι* only once in 4 M.), § 21, 7: pf. unused excepting for a wrong reading in W. xvii. 9 A: *ἐφοβούμην -ήθην* regular. The act. of the *simplex*, apart from *ἐφόβει* W. xvii. 9, is unrepresented, being replaced in Dan. Θ iv. 2 and 2 Es. (four times) by the new form **φοβερίζω** (cf. *φοβερισμός* Ψ lxxxvii. 17): but *ἐκφοβέω* remains (chiefly in the phrase *οὐκ ἔσται ὁ ἐκφοβῶν*), this prep. tending to confer a transitive force upon some compounds in late Greek (cf. *ἐξαμαρτάνω* "cause to sin").

Φορέω: *φορέσω*, *ἐφόρεσα*, § 18, 1.

Φρυάσσω (*-άττομαι*): post-class. = "neigh" of horses and met. "be insolent" or "proud": in LXX only in the latter sense, in the act. (unrecorded elsewhere) *ἐφρύαξαν ἔθνη* Ψ ii. 1, and in mid.-pass. *φρυαττόμενος* (or **φρυττόμενος** A, cf. § 6, 50), 2 M. vii. 34, perf. part. *πεφρυασμένος -αγμένος*, § 18, 3 (iii). The subst. *φρύαγμα* "pride" (in the group Jer. *α*—Ez. *α*—Min. Proph. and 3 M.) is classical in the literal sense "snorting."

Φυλάσσω (and *-άττω*, lit., § 7, 46) *δια-*, *προ-* 2 K. xxii. 24: pf. act. *πεφύλακα* 1 K. xxv. 21 (for Att. *-αχα*): the pf. pass. is used both in its class. mid. sense (Ez. xviii. 9, cf. 2 Es. iv. 22) and passively, e.g. Gen. xli. 36: the fut. pass. *φυλαχθήσομαι* Jer. iii. 5, Ψ xxxvi. 28 is post-class.: term. *ἐφύλαξες* Cod. A, § 17, 8: redupl. *φεφύλαξαι* Cod. A, § 16, 7.

Φυτεύω: pf. act. (post-class.) *πεφύτευκαν*, § 17, 3.

Φύω: the pres. act. is used intransitively (late) in Dt. xxix. 18, else trans.: fut. *φυήσω* (trans.) Is. xxxvii. 31 (for class. *φύσω*), but *ἀναφύσει* (intr.) ib. xxxiv. 13 (corrected to *-φυήσει* by late hands of Bℵ): the aor. act. is absent (excepting *φύσαντες* Jer. xxxviii. 5 AQ*, an error for *φυτεύσ.*) and the pf. act. is

[1] Including Tob. v. 19 *ἀργύριον τῷ ἀργ. μὴ φθάσαι* "let not money (the deposit which Tobias is going to recover) come (or be added) to money." "Be not greedy to add money to money" of A.V. and R.V. is a neat paraphrase, but the marginal note in A.V. (not in R.V.) is needed to explain the construction.

confined to literary portions: the act. 2nd aor. *ἔφυν* is replaced by the pass. *ἀν- προσ- εφύην*, § 21, 3.

Φωτίζω (not before Aristot.) "give light" and met. "enlighten," "instruct": fut. *φωτιῶ* and *-ίσω*, § 20, 1 (i): pass. tenses *ἐφωτίσθην φωτισθήσομαι* in Ψ.

Χαίρω (*ἐπι-*, and once each *κατα-* Prov. i. 26, *προσ-* ib. viii. 30, *συγ-* Gen. xxi. 6): the fut. (not the class. *χαιρήσω*) takes two late forms (i) in the *simplex* *χαρήσομαι* (12 undisputed exx.), (ii) in compos. *-χαροῦμαι, ἐπι-* Hos. x. 5, Mic. iv. 11, Sir. xxiii. 3, *κατα-* Prov. i. 26, *συγ-* Gen. xxi. 6: the latter occurs also in the *simplex* in Zech. iv. 10 B*ℵ*Q* (with v.l. *-ήσονται*), ib. x. 7 though *χαρήσεται* occurs in the same *v.*, § 20, 3: aor. *ἐχάρην* regular except for the loss of the second aspirated letter in the imperat. *χάρητι*, § 7, 13: perf. unattested.

Χέω and once **-χύν(ν)ω**, § 19, 2: new fut. *χεῶ χεεῖς* for *χέω χεῖς*, § 20, 1 (iii): contracted and uncontracted forms, § 22, 3: pf. act. (post-class.) *ἐκκέχυκα* Ez. xxiv. 7: fut. pass. *χυθήσομαι* (one ex. with *συγ-* in Demosth.) Jl. ii. 2 and in comp. with *δια- ἐκ- συγ-*.

Χράομαι: inf. *χρῆσθαι* (Att.) and once *χρᾶσθαι*, § 22, 2: fut. pf. *κεχρήσεται* "shall have need" Ep. J. 58 can be paralleled only from Theocr. xvi. 73.

Χρίω: pf. pass. *κέχρισμαι* (with *χρίσμα*) replaces Att. *κέχριμαι* (*χρῖμα*, ? *χρίμα*), but aor. pass. *ἐχρίσθην* (? *ἐχρήθη* 2 K. i. 21 A = *ἐχρίθη*) is Attic, § 18, 2: the fut. pass. *χρισθήσομαι* Ex. xxx. 32 is post-class., as is also the pf. act. *κέχρικα* 1 K. x. 1, 2 K. ii. 7, 4 K. ix. 3, 6, 12: term. *ἐνεχρίοσαν* Cod. ℵ, § 17, 5.

(**Ψάω**) only in the aor. pass. *συνεψήσθην* (v.l. *-ηθην*) "swept away" in Jer., § 18, 2: the compound occurs in the act. in Ptolemaic papyri.

Ψύχω is both trans. and intrans., e.g. *ὡς ψύχει λάκκος ὕδωρ, οὕτως ψύχει κακία αὐτῆς* Jer. vi. 7, cf. *καταψύξατε* "cool yourselves" Gen. xviii. 4: pf. act. (unattested in class. Gk) *ἀνεψυχότα* 2 M. xiii. 11: no pass. forms used.

Ψωμίζω: fut. *ψωμιῶ* and *-ίσω*, § 20, 1 (i).

Ὠδίνω, in class. Gk confined to pres., in LXX has impf. *ὤδινον* Is. xxiii. 4, lxvi. 8, and, as from a contract verb, *ὠδινήσω, ὠδίνησα* (causative in Sir. xliii. 17 A): Aquila further has 1 aor. pass. and mid.

Ὠθέω: aug., § 16, 6: the pf. pass. of the *simplex*, *ὠσμένῳ* Ψ lxi. 4, is unclassical.

(**Ὠνέομαι**) unused: see *πρίαμαι*.

I. INDEX OF SUBJECTS

A, Codex: see Alexandrinus
Accusative sing. 146 f. (*-αν* for *-α*), 176 (*-ῆν* for *-ῆ*), 150: plur. (*-ες* for *-ας* etc.) 73, 145, 147 ff., 150
Adjectives, declension of 172–181: comparison of 181–186
Adjurations, use of *ὅτι* and *εἰ* in 54
Adverbs, comparison of 183: replaced by adj. (*πρότερος*) 183: numeral adverbs 189 f.
"Alexandrian dialect" 19 f.
Alexandrinus, Codex, Egyptian origin of 72, 101, 110: text mainly inferior and secondary 65, 106, 107 *bis*, 218 *bis*, 221 n. 2, 258: text probably original 81 (Is.), 93 (Ψ), 152 (Sir.): Hexaplaric interpolations frequent 3 f., cf. Aquila: conjectural emendation of Greek 205 n. 3: orthography and accidence mainly of later date than autographs 55 ff., 67 (Numbers perhaps written in two parts), 72, 74, 98 n. 3 (introduces Attic forms), 110, 115 (1 and 2 Es. a single volume in an ancestor of A), 131, 147 and 176 (3rd decl. acc. in *-αν -ῆν*), 188 (*ἓξ καὶ δέκα*), 212 (*γενάμενος* in Jer.), 234 (*ἔλειπον* etc.), 241 (*δυνηθήσομαι* etc.), 255 (*ἔθησα, ἔδωσα*): foreshadows modern Greek 158, 179, 205 f. (loss of redupl.), 215 f., 241 f.
Analogy plays large part in the *κοινή* 21, 73, 79 f., 89, 103 n., 120 (*δυσεβήϛ*), 124 f., 127 *bis*, 128 (*ἑκών*), 129 (*εὑρίσκω*), 174, 178 f., 189, 201 n., 202. Cf. Assimilation
Anaptyxis in ℵ 98
Anthropomorphism avoided 44
Aorist, 1st, extension of, at cost of 2nd aor. 209 ff., 233 f.: sigmatic for unsigmatic 235: in pass. partly replaced by 2nd aor. 236 f.: new 1st aor. pass. 238: 1st aor. pass. replaces 1st aor. mid. 238 ff.: mixture of aor. and fut. inf. mid. 76, 287
Aorist, 2nd, old forms retained longest in inf. 210 (*ἐνεγκεῖν, εἰπεῖν*): 2nd aor. pass. for 2nd aor. act. 235
Apocalypse, style of 21 n.: *δοῦλος* 8: *ἐνώπιον* 43 n.: rel. + demonstr. pron. 46 n.: 240 n.
Apostolic Fathers: see Patristic
Appellative taken for proper name 32 f.
Apposition of verbs 51 f. with n.
Aquila, pedantic literalism of 9: *περὶ λαλιᾶϛ* (*π. λόγου*) 41: *ἐπιστρέφειν* 53: *σύν* 55, 133 n.: *ἐγώ εἰμι* 55: *κάθοδος* 190: misc. 49, 112 n.: interpolations in A text from Aq., mainly in 3—4 K., 3, 152, 157, 190, 218, 227, 231 n., 241, 287 f.: (?) similar interp. in Joshua 4
Aramaic influence on LXX Greek xx, 28, 34 (*γαζαρηνός, γειώρας*), 36 (*σαμβύκη*?)
Archaism in the uncials 60
Archite, Hushai the 37
Aristeas 13, 15 n., 76, 170 n. 3, 200 n., 247 n., 264, 279 (*κατοίομαι*)
Aristophanes 45, 81: Scholiast on 105 n.
Aristotle, a precursor of the *κοινή* 17, 143 n., 144
Article, omission of 24 f.: sing. art. with plur. Heb. noun 34: loses aspirate 129: crasis with 138: Hebr. art. in transliterations, with Greek art. added 33 f.
Asiatic languages and the *κοινή* 20: Asiatic orthography 98, 110, 212 n. (term. *-αν*)
Aspirate, irregular insertion and omission of 124 ff.: throwing back of 126 f. (*ἐφιορκεῖν, ὀλίγος, Ἰούδας*)
Aspirated consonant, mixture of, with

tenuis 102 : transposition of 103 : insertion and omission of 104 : omission of one of two 116, 129, cf. 236 : doubling of 121
Assimilation, of vowels (esp. unaccented or flanking liquids) 76 f., 84, 87 f., 96 f., 165 n., 176, 219 : of consonants 130 ff. : of declensions 140 f., 146 : of cases 74, 147 ff., 151 : of masc. and neut. 151, 174. Cf. Analogy
"Attic" declension 144 f., 173
Atticism 114, 186 n., 187, 204 (in K. βδ), 253 (? *ἐστώς*)
Augment 74 n. (*ἐκαθέρισα*), 195 ff.
Authorized Version 47 n.
Autographs of LXX 55 ff., 71
ℵ, Codex : see Sinaiticus

B, Codex : see Vaticanus
Babrius 226
Barnabas, Epistle of 76
Baruch, the two portions *α* and *β* 13 : Bar. *α* by the translator of Jer. *β* 12 : Bar. *β*, date of 6, 61 n. (*οὐδείς*), 102, 278 n.
Bezae, Codex 188 n.
"Biblical Greek" 16, 80 n., 83, 104 f. Cf. "Jewish Greek," Vocabulary
Birthplaces of the uncials 71 f.
Bisection of LXX books 65 ff., 122 n.
Boeotian dialect 112 n., 129 n., 210 n. and 213 (*-οσαν*)
Byzantine epoch 109, 134. Cf. *Κοινή*, periods in

Caesarea suggested birthplace of Cod. B 72
Canon, Hebrew, translations made in order of viii : influence of canonization on Greek style 15, 30 f.
Causative meaning of verbs in *-εύω* 88 (281 not, as in N.T., *περισσεύω*) : in *-έω* etc., *πνεύσω ζήσω* 232, *ἐβλάστησα* 234, *ἀναβλέψατε* 262, *δύσω* 265, *ἐθάμβησα* 269, *ὑστέρησα* 288, *προφθάσω* 289 : of compounds of *ἐκ-*, *ἐξαμαρτάνω* 259, *ἐξῆρψα* 267, *ἐξιλάσκομαι* 270 f., *ἐκφοβέω* 289
Chronicles, expurgation in the original 11 : Chron. LXX, the version of Theodotion (?) xx, 167 n. : does not use "Hebraic" *υἱός* nor *παραγίνομαι* except at end of 2 Ch. 41 f., 267 n. : *οὐθείς* in 2 Ch. 61
Commerce, effect of, in fusing the old dialects 17
Comparison, degrees of 23 f., 181 ff. : comparative for superl. 181, for pos. 183 (*ἀνώτερον* etc.)
Composition, assimilation of final *ν* in 132 ff.
Compound words : see Word-formation
Concord, rules of, violated 23
Conjunctive, deliberate, following fut. ind. 91 : conj. *vice* opt. 193 n. : replaced by ind. 193 f. : conj. of 2 aor. of *δίδωμι* 255 f.
Consonants, interchange of 100 ff. : insertion of 108 ff. : omission of 111 ff. : single and double consonants 117 ff., *ρρ* and *ρ* 118 f., doubling of aspirated letter 121 : *σσ* and *ττ* 121 ff. : *ρσ* and *ρρ* 123 f. : assimilation of 130 ff. : variable final cons. 134 ff.
Constructio ad sensum 23
Contract verbs 241 ff. : term. *-οῦσαν* 213 f. : short vowel in tenses 218 f. Cf. Mute stem
Contracted and uncontracted forms 98 f., 144, 172 f.
Coordination of sentences 24, 55
Coptic influence on the *κοινή* 20, 73 n., 84 : Coptic palaeography 72. Cf. Egypt, Sahidic
Countries, names of, expressed adjectively 169 f.
Crasis 137 f., 206 n.

Daniel, Greek words in the Aramaic of 35 n. : Daniel 0, a partial paraphrase by writer of 1 Es. 12 : Daniel Θ, later orthography of 132 ff. : N.T. quotations agreeing with Θ 15. Cf. Theodotion
Dative still common 23 : cognate dat. c. vb. = Heb. inf. abs. 48 ff. : dat. sg. of 1 decl. nouns in *α* pure 140 ff., of 3 decl. 86 (*-ι* for *-ει* in B), 149, 165 (*Ἰησοῖ*)
David, Song and Last Words of, in style of Θ 14 f.
Demetrius Ixion 19

Dentals, interchange of 103 ff.: omission of 116
Deponent verbs, pass. for mid. tenses in 238 ff.
Deuteronomy, slight divergence from Pent. in vocabulary etc. 14, 48: more marked in closing chapters 8 n., 14, 39: optat. 24: *οὐδείς* 61: *εἶδησα* B text 278
Dialects, disappearance of the old 18. Cf. Alexandrian, Doric, Ionic, etc.
Digamma, (?) replaced by aspirate 124
Diminutives in *-είδιον* 87 n.
Diphthongs, monophthongisation of 71, 93 f., 141 (*ι* unpronounced in *υι*)
Dissimilation 130
Distributive use of *δύο δύο* 54
Divine names, renderings of, in Job Θ 4
Division of labour of translators and scribes 11 f., 65 ff.
Doric, slight influence of, on *κοινή* 76, 222 n.: Doric forms 143, 146 *bis*, 162, 276 (*μοιχάομαι*), 282 (*πιάζω*)
Doublets 31, 32 f., 38 (*ῥάχις*), (47), 126 (*? οὐχ ἰδού*), 228, 279 (*ὥλετο*)
Dual, loss of 22, 195: and of words expressing duality 22, 45, 192: *δυεῖν* sole vestige of 92

E, Codex 63 n.
Ecclesiastes LXX the work of Aquila 13, 31, 60 f.
Egyptian influence on the *κοινή* seen in phonetics and orthography 20, 100 n., 103, 111, 112: in vocabulary 32 n. (150, 169): Egyptian origin of uncial MSS 72
Elision 136 f.
Epic forms: see Homer, Vocabulary
Epistolary formulae in papyri 57 n.
Esau, the blessing of 141
Esdras, 1 and 2, subscriptions to 111 n.
1 Esdras, a partial paraphrase 12 (cf. Dan. O), in literary style 161 with n.: peculiarities of chap. v 164 with n. 4
2 Esdras, probably the work of Θ xx, 13: orthogr. *o=οι* 93, *-οσαν* common 213: *ἠνοίγην*, *κατελίπην* 236 f.: *παραγίνομαι* unused 267 n. Cf. Historical books, later
Esther, paraphrastic 15
Etymology, mistaken popular 74 n. 3, *μετοξύ* 77, 85, 94, 118, *Μωυσῆς* 163 n., *Ἱεροσόλυμα* 168, 206 f.: augment affected by etym. 200
Euphony, insertion of consonant for 110 f.: in combination of words and syllables 129 ff.
Eupolemus 170 n. 3
Exodus, an early version 28: conclusion probably rather later than the rest 14, 257: clerical division into two parts 66 f., 68 n.: *ῥητός* 41: *οὐδείς* 61: *ἤ μήν* 83. Cf. Hexateuch, Pentateuch
Expurgation in Kingdoms (LXX) and Chronicles (Heb.) 11
Ezekiel, divisions of 11 f.
Ez. *α*, akin to and contemporary with Min. Prophets and Jer. *α* 8, 12, 73 n., 139, 273 (*κόψομαι*), 285 n. (*-σκορπίζω*): with Min. Prophets 170 with n. 1, 261 (*βιβάζω*): with Jer. *α* 167, 276 (*μειχ.*): with K. *α*, K. *ββ* 265 (*ἐνδεδυκώς*): misc. *ἕτερος* 45, *οὐδείς* 61, 139, *ἐγενόμην* 239
Ez. *β*, absence of transliteration in 32: misc. *λάκκος* (*βόθρος*) 37, *εἰ μήν* 83 n. 3, 139, 167, 172 n., 175 with n., *ἐγενήθην* 239
Ez. *ββ*, a Pentecost lesson 11

Fall, influence of the story of the, on later translators 48 n.
Feminine: see Gender
Future, mixture of fut. and aor. inf. mid. 76, 287: not confused with conj. 91: for imperat. 194: fut. pf. rare 194, 270 (*τεθνήξ.*): 2 sing. mid. *-εσαι* 218: Attic fut. 228 ff.: fut. act. for mid. 231 ff.: differentiated from pres. 230: new fut. pass. 240 f. (cf. § 24 *pass.*)

Gender in Decl. II fluctuates between m. and fem. 145 f., between m. and nt. 153 ff.: cf. fluctuation between Decl. II and III 158 ff.
Genealogies, interpolations in 162
Genesis, *εἰ μήν* (=כי) 54 and *ἤ μήν* 83: *οὐθείς* 61: true superlatives in *-ταtος* 182. Cf. Hexateuch, Pentateuch

Genitive, of quality, extended use of 23: gen. abs. freely used 24: of age, in Hexat. etc. 41: gen. sing. 140 ff. (nouns in *α* pure), 149, 151, 162 (Doric *-α*), 165 (Ἰησοῖ): gen. pl. uncontracted and contr. 151: c. *ἐγγίζειν* 167 n.
Geography, translators' knowledge of 166 f. with n. 7: geographical terms transliterated 32 f.
Grammarians, ancient 19, 75. Cf. Herodian, Moeris, Phrynichus etc.
"Greek books" (not translations) avoid translators' equivalents for inf. abs. 49: avoid introductory *ἐγένετο* 52. Cf. Literary books
Grouping of LXX books 6 ff.
Gutturals, interchange of 101 ff.: omission of 115 f.: assimilation of final *ν* before 132 f.

Haplology 114, 115 n.
Hebraisms, in Job Θ 4: reduction in number of supposed 26 ff.: in vocabulary 31 ff., Hellenized Heb. words 32, 34 ff.: in meaning and uses of words and in syntax 39 ff.: stages in naturalization of Heb. idiom 44
Hebrew spelling, minutiae of, reflected in translation of Pent. 152 n.
Hellenistic Greek: see *Κοινή*
Herodian 210 n.
Herodotus 34, 35, *ἀριθμῷ* 39, 46 n., 48, 62, 265 (*δοκιμάζω*)
Heterogeneity gives way to uniformity 91
Hexapla, influence of, on LXX text 2, 14 (end of Deut.): interpolations from 3 ff., 231 n., 238 (Is. B text), 239, 269 (*ζων.*). Cf. Aquila, Theodotion
Hexateuch, *λατρεύειν* 8: avoids Hebraic *υἱός* 41 f.: omits introductory *καὶ ἔσται* 52 n.: *εὐθής* unknown to 178 n.: *ὑμῶν αὐτῶν* etc. 191: *ἑστηκώς* (not *ἑστώς*) 253. Cf. Pentateuch
Hiatus, avoidance of 111 n., 134 f., 138 f.
Historical books, late group of 9: in style of Θ 14: literalism of 9, 29 f., *διδόναι=τιθέναι* 39, 40 ff., *ἀνήρ=ἕκαστος* 45, participial rendering of inf. abs. 48 f., *ἐγένετο καὶ* 51, 55: transliterations in 31: miscell. *ἐν* for *εἰς* 25, *προσέθηκα* 53, *ὀλι(γ)οῦν* 112, no place-names in *-(ε)ῖτις* 170 n. 1, 189, term. *-αν* 211, not *-οσαν* (except 2 Es.) 213, *ἑστώς* 253. Cf. 2 Esdras, Judges, Kingdoms
Homer, use of, in Proverbs 152, and Job (q.v.): cf. Vocabulary
Hypereides 46 n.

ἰ sounds, coalescence or avoidance of successive 63, 84, 271 n.
Illiteracy, indications of, *ει=ῐ* 86: mixture of *υ* and *οι* 94
Imitation of Hebrew words in translation 14, 36 ff.
Imperative, 2nd aor. pass., term. of 104: replaced by fut. 194: term. *-σαν* 214 f.
Imperfect, *ἐγίνετο=*הָיָה(וַ) 52: term. *-αν* 212, *-οσαν* etc. 214: *ἔλειπον* in A text 234
Imperial (Roman) epoch, linguistic characteristics of 72, 109, 112, 141. Cf. *Κοινή*, periods of
Imprecations, *εἰ* in 54
Indeclinable stage precedes extinction *-ως* 173, *πλήρης* 176: *ἥμισυς -συ* 180: *χείρω, δύο* 186
Infinitive, frequent, use of articular inf. extended 24, 194: anarthrous inf. with verbs of motion 24: epexegetic inf. frequent ib. n.: c. *ἐγένετο, συνέβη* etc. 50 ff.: c. *προστιθέναι* in Min. Prophets 53, c. *ἐπιστρέφειν* etc. 53 f.: *vice* participle c. *(προ)φθάνειν* 54: mixture of aor. and fut. mid. 76, 287 (*τεύξασθαι*): old forms remain longest in inf. 210 (*ἐνεγκεῖν, εἰπεῖν*), cf. 257 (*ἰέναι*)
Infinitive absolute, Hebrew, renderings of 47 ff.
Inscriptions, Greek of the 18 f.: *οὐθείς, οὐδ.* in 58: *τεσσεράκοντα* etc. in Asiatic inscr. 62: Attic *passim*
Interpolations: passages absent from M.T. in which Greek style suggests interpolation 47 n., (70 with xx),

166 with n. 4, 169 n. 5, 230, 239: 171 sub fin.: 184 n. 1. Cf. Hexapla
Ionic dialect and its influence on the *κοινή* 62, 73, 74 n., 106 n., 107, 110, 141 f., 285 (*σκορπίζω*).
Irenaeus (Minutius Pacatus) 19
Isaiah, style good, version poor 12: an early version ix, 28: *σαβαώθ* (with 1 K.) 9: avoids Hebraisms 41 f.: *ἕτερος* 45: *οὐδείς* usual 61, compounds *ἐξουθ- ἐξουδ-* unused 105: A text correct 81: class. forms in B text 151
Isocrates 138
Isolation of syllables 132: of words 136
Itacisms 68 f. (*αι* and *ε* in *Ψ* and pap.), 73, 126, 177, 179

Jeremiah, divisions of 11: date of *α* and *β* (*οὐθείς* in both) 61
Jer. *α*, akin to Min. Prophets 9 and Ez. *α* q.v.: with K. *α* 253 (*-έστακα*)
Jer. *β*, *παῖς* 8: peculiarities of 14, 37 f., 163 n. 1, 185 (*βελτίων*), 279 (*ὄλλυμι*)
Jer. *α* and *β* (central chaps.), possible traces of compiler of 11, 88 n., 92, 226
Jer. *γ* (liii) an appendix 11, 70 n., 88, 93, 97, 123, 189 n., 250
Jerome on *βάρις* 34, on *ἱερεῖς* 37 f.
"Jewish-Greek" 26, 79: Jews in Egypt 27. Cf. "Biblical Greek," Vocabulary
Job, a partial version supplemented from Θ 3 f.: proem and conclusion contrasted with main portion 171. Job O, absence of transliteration in 32: has class. *ἦ μήν* 83: imitates Homer and the poets 173, 249, 279 (*ὀλέκω, ὄλλυμι*): *ἐγγύτατοι* 182: *πότερον* 192. For Job Θ see Theodotion
Josephus, his Greek text of Kingdoms 15: absence of Hebraisms in his writings 28, with one exception 53: orthog. 97 n., 106: accidence 145, 156, 161, 163 n., 164, 166, 169 n. 6, 170 n., 196 n., 220 n., 234 n.
Joshua, style of 7: date of viii, 14: *οὐθείς* 61: with Ez. *α* and Min. Prophets 170 with n. 1: *-οσαν* frequent 213. Cf. Hexateuch
Judges (B text) late: *ἀγαθώτερος* 184, *τέτρασιν* 187, *βιβρώσκω* 226, *ἔλειψα* 234, *ἐστάθησαν* 254, *ἦς* 256, *φέρω*= *ἄγω* 258 n. Cf. Historical books

Kethubim: see Writings
Kingdoms, divisions of books of 10 f.: Heb. inf. abs. in 48 f.: B text of 2—4 K. 78 n.: A text of 3—4 K., interpolations in, see Aquila
K. *α*, *σαβαώθ* 9: *ἕκαστος* 45 n.: mid. *προσέθετο* 53: *οὐθείς* 61: *ἐξουθενεῖν -ουδενοῦν* 105: *Ἀρμαθαίμ* 168
K. *ββ*, *Παντοκράτωρ* 9: *ἕκαστος* 45 n.: *ἔσει* etc. 217
K. *γγ*, paraphrastic style of 10: *ἕκαστος* 45 n.: *οὐθείς* 61: 3 K., orthography of 88
K. *βδ* (= *βγ* + *γδ*), date of 15: characteristics of 10, 30: Hebraic *υἱός* 41: *ἀνήρ* for *ἕκαστος* 45 n.: unintelligent Atticism in 204. K. *βγ*, *οὐδείς* 61: *ἔσῃ* etc. 217. K. *γδ* (4 K.), *ἐγένετο καί* 51: plur. of *γῆ* 143
Κοινή, the 16 ff.: definition of 16: vernacular and literary 17: origin and formative elements 17: (?) without dialects 18, 71, 117 n.: slight influence of foreign languages on 20: dominant characteristics of 21, illustrated from LXX 22 ff.: aims at simplification 29. Periods in *κοινή* (1) Ptolemaic, (2) Roman, (3) Byzantine 108 f.: contrast between early and late, Ptolemaic and Roman 155, 163 n. 3: transition period at end of ii/B.C. 58 f., 68, 105: other changes in ii/B.C. 72 (131), 142, 146, 190: in i/A.D. 102, 120, 176: in ii/A.D. 126, 129, 184, 212. Cf. Byz. and Imperial epoch

Labials, interchange of 105 ff.: omission of 117: assimilation of final *ν* before 132 f.
Latin influence on the *κοινή* 20: in orthography 92 n.
Lectionary influence seen in Ez. *ββ* 12: synagogue lessons 29

Legendary additions in the "Writings" 15
Leviticus, *οὐθείς* 61 : written in two parts 66
Liquids, the, their influence on spelling 73 ff., 77 f., 81, 84, 88, 97, 165 n. : interchange of 107 f. : omission of 116. Liquid stem, verbs with 223 f.
Lists of names, interpolations in 162
Literary books, characteristics of 81 f., 92, 98, 105, 122 (*ττ*), 123 (*ρρ*), 138, 182 (*-τατος*), 185 (with Pent.), 242 (*ἐλεεῖν*), 247 (*ἵστησι*), 253 (*τεθνάναι* etc.), 255 (*ἔθεσαν*). Cf. "Greek books"
"Lord of Hosts," renderings of 8 f.
Lucianic text, division of Kingdom books in 10 f.
Luke, the two styles in 27 : Hebraic style of, under influence of LXX 30, 40 n., 41, 49, 50 ff. (*ἐγένετο*), 53 (*προσέθετο*) : *ἐνώπιον* frequent 43 n. : *οὐθείς* occasionally 62 : *ἀνάθεμα -θημα* 80 : *δεσμά* 154 : *ἐμνηστευμένη* 205 : *παραγίνομαι* 267 n.

2 Maccabees, a literary book 137, 145, 155, 188
3 Maccabees, literary 82
4 Maccabees, date of 6, 61 (*οὐδείς*) : literary and Atticistic, uses optative 24 and 193, 81 (*πλέον*), 98, 137, 148, 158 n., 179, 182, 215 *bis*, 241, 270 (*τεθνήξομαι*) : but keeps some vulgar forms 160
Malachi, *πλέον* 81
Mark, *ἐνώπιον* unused in 43 n
Masculine : see Gender
Massoretic text : see Interpolations
Matthew, *ἐνώπιον* unused in 43 n.
Measures and weights transliterated 32
Metaplasmus 151, 153–160, 187
Middle fut. replaced by fut. act. 231 ff. : middle aor. and fut. replaced by pass. tenses 238 ff.
Minaeans in Chron. 167 n.
Minor Prophets akin to Ez. *α* and Jer. *α*, see Ezekiel : with K. *α* 259 (*ἄλλομαι*) : with K. *γγ* 273 (*κόψομαι*) : act. *προσθήσω* etc. 53 : usually *οὐδείς* 61
"Mixed declension" of proper names 162 ff.
Mixture of texts 3 f.
Modern Greek, its value for illustration of the *κοινή* 21 : misc. 25, 42 n., 75 n., 88, 106 n., 107, 111 n., 113 (*λέει*), 117 with n., 124, 141 n., 158, 172, 179, 180 n. 9, 181 n., 184, 187, 188 n., 189 n., 190 *bis*, 193, 195 f., 197, 198 *bis*, 205 f., 209 with n., 213, 219 n. 1 and 3, 225, 233, 236, 241, 244, 256, 257 *bis*
Moeris 150, 154
Month, numerals expressing days of 189
Mountains, names of, expressed adjectivally 170 f.
Musical instruments, Phoenician origin of names of 35 f.
Mute stem, verbs with 222 f. : mute for contract verbs 259 (s. v. *ἁλήθω*)

Nasals interchanged with labials 106 f. : omission of 117 : effect of, on vowels 176
Negative, emphatic, expressed by *εἰ* 54
Neuter plurals with plur. and sing. vb. 23 : neut. of persons 174 f. Cf. Gender
New Testament, words for "servant" 8 : does not use *ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς* 43 n., nor participle for Heb. inf. abs. 49 : *οὐθείς* rare 62 : influence of N. T. quotations on LXX text 231 f. (*ἀκούσω, βλέψω*) : N. T. contrasted with LXX 142 (*-ρας -ρης*), 156 (*ἑκατόνταρχος -άρχης*), 163 f. (*Μωυσῆς*, declension of), 165 f. (*Σαλωμών*, spelling and decl.), 193 n. (optat.), 211 (*-οσαν -αν*), 225 (*χέω -χύννω*), 228, 230 (*ὁλῶ, ὁλέσω*), 231 (*ἔδομαι φάγ.*), 244 f. (*-μι* and *-ω*), 254 (*ἔστην, ἐστάθην*), 256 (*ἦσθα, ἦς*), 260 f. *αὐξάνω* (trans. and intr.), 281 (*περισσεύω*)
Nominative, drifting into the (*nom. pendens*) 23, 149 n. : as name-case 23, 161 n. 5 : relation of, to cases (Decl. III) 149 f. : assimilation of, to cases 151
Numbers, possibly written in two parts 67 : *οὐδείς* 61

Numerals 186–190: compounds of, 156: numerical statement placed in parenthesis 149 n.

Optative rare but less so than in N. T., frequent in 4 Macc. 24, 193: replaced by conj. 193 n.: new terminations 215: *δῴην* 256
Order of words in compound numbers 187 ff.
Origen: see Hexapla
Orthography of uncials and papyri 55 ff., 71 ff.
Overworking of Greek phrases resembling the Hebrew 29

Palaeography of ℵ and A 72
Papyri, of Herculaneum 18: Egyptian pap. and the uncials 55 ff.: developments in formulae in 57 n., 101 n. 2, 131 n., 288 (*ἐὰν φαίνηται*): misc. 42 n., 47 (*ἐν* of accompaniment), 51 n. (apposition of verbs). Cf. *Κοινή*, periods in
Paraphrases *vice* literalism in early books 42, 43 (*ἀρέσκειν* etc.): paraphrastic versions 13, 15
Parenthesis, numerical statement in 149 n.
Partial translations, of Job 4: (?) of Jer. and Ez. 11: of Ezra and Daniel 12: of the "Writings" 15
Participle, for finite vb. 24: part. + fin. vb. = Heb. inf. abs. 48 ff.: replaced (with *-φθάνειν*) by inf. 54: *-ες* for *-ας* in pres. part. 149: fut. part. rare 194 (49): *εἶμι* retained longest in the part. 257
Particles, elision with 137
Passive (middle) retains old forms longer than the active 196, 224 n., 245
Patristic writings 121 n., 241 n., 257 (revival of *εἶμι*)
Pentateuch, variety of renderings in 4 n.: unity and date of viii, 6, 13 f. 61, 191: transliteration rare in 32 f.: *ἐγένετο* preferred to *ἐγ. καὶ* in Gen. and Ex. 51: style adapted to subject-matter 142: renderings characteristic of 7, 13 f., 48: contrasted with later books by more classical style 9, 13, 30, 41, 43, 45 (*ἕτερος*), 105, 191 (correct use of *ὅδε*), 218 (*φάγῃ*), 224, 231 (*ἔδομαι*), 237 (*κατενύχθην*): unites with the literary books 185 *bis*, 204, 253 (*ἐστάθην*): fut. ind. + delib. conj. 91: *ἀμνόν* and *ἄρνα* etc. 152 n.: does not use place-names in *-αία -(ε)ῖτις* 170 n. 1, nor *-σκορπίζω* 285 n. Cf. Hexateuch
Pentecost lesson 11
Perfect for aorist 24: term. *-αν* 212
Pergamus, inscriptions of 62
Periphrastic conjugation 24, 195
Persian origin, words of reputed, *μανδύας, μανιάκης* 35
Philo Jud. 28, 163 n., 164
Phocylides, pseudo- 15 n.
Phoenician origin, Greek words of 34 ff.
Phonetics 71 ff., 94 n.: pronunciation of *υ* 92 n., 95: of *ζ* 108, 111: of *γ* 111, 126 f.: influence of Egypt in phonetics 20, 163 n. (*ωυ*), Egyptian difficulty in pronouncing *γ* and *δ* 100 n., 103, 112 n. 2
Photius 220, 221 n.
Phrygian Greek 95 n.
Phrynichus 92 n., 99 n., 104, 107, 112, 285 (*σκορπίζω*)
Physiognomical expressions in Heb. and Gk. 42 ff.
Place-names: see Proper names
Pluperfect, loss of syll. aug. in 196 f.: term. *-εισαν* 216
Plutarch 92, 105 n.
Poetical passages, Pentateuch translators use Ionic (poetical) forms in 141 f.
Polybius 43 (use of *πρόσωπον*), 77, 92, 154, 170 n., 187, 191 n., 196 n., 264
Positive for comp. and superl. 181
Prepositions, new forms of 25: replace acc. (after the Heb.) 46 f.: a derelict prep. 97 n.: elision with 137
Present tense, new forms of 224 ff.: historic pres. practically absent from K. *βδ* 24
Pronouns 190 ff.: substitutes for 45 f.: demonstr. + relat. 46: indefinite relative (*ὃς ἐάν, ὃς ἄν*) 65–68
Pronunciation: see Phonetics

Proper names, personal 160–166, place-names 166–171, do. translated 31, gentilic 171: appellatives mistaken for 32 f.: absence of elision before 136 f.: misc. 143, 146: cf. Ἀρών, Ἰσάκ, Ἰούδας etc.
Prophetical books, dates of viii f., 61: prefer ἐγένετο to ἐγ. καὶ 51: cf. Sinaiticus, Isaiah etc.
Prothetic vowel 97
Proverbs, date of 16, 61, 166: extra-Biblical maxims in 15: absence of transliteration in 32: orthography in 94, 132 f. (late): fragments of verse in 15 n., 137, cf. 270 n.: imitates Homer 152 and the poets 279 (ὅλλυμι), cf. 173 (ἀεργός): literary style of 143, 158 n., 249
Psalms, absence of transliteration in 32: division into two parts 68 f., 88, 135 with n., 158 n., 200 n.: but translation homogeneous 69: late orthography of 132 ff.: Appendix to 15: titles of xix (? later than original version), 32
Psalms of Solomon 166 n., 175
Psilosis 127 ff.
Ptolemaic age: see Κοινή, periods of
Pure stem, verbs with 218 ff.

Question expressing a wish 54

Rabbinical writings, Greek words in 21 n.
Reduplication 204 ff.: dropped in μνήσκομαι 227
Rhinocorura 167 n.
Rhythm, in Wisdom 91 n.: loss of sense of 22
Rolls, writing of books on two 65
Roman epoch: see Imperial, Κοινή

Sahidic 101 n., 107 n., cf. Coptic: Sahidic version of Job 4
Scribes, two per book in primitive MSS 66 f.
Scriptio plena: see Elision
Semitic element in LXX Greek 25 ff.: cf. Hebraisms, Aramaic
Septuagint translation, primary purpose of 28 f.
"Servant of the Lord," renderings of 7 f.
Sibylline Oracles 79 n., 273 n.
Sinaiticus, Codex, orthography (Egyptian) of the Prophetical portion 112 ff., 119 f., 130, 147 (cf. 176): difference in orthography of other books 113: vulgarisms in 55 ff., 72, 78
Sira, Ben, reference in Prologue to Greek versions of Scripture 15 f., 59 f.: contrast in style of Prol. and body of work 27: date of (οὐθείς and οὐδ., ἐξουθ. and ἐξουδ.) 61 f., 105: orthography of 91 (ο and ω), 94: possibly divided into 2 parts 122 n.: literary forms in 143, 149
Song of Moses 141
Song of Solomon, notes in Cod. ℵ 259
Sophocles, νάβλα 35, προστίθεσθαι 52 f.
Spirants, interchange of 108: spirantic pronunciation of guttural 111
Strabo 36 (on musical instruments), 92, 106, 118 n., 143 n.
Style, classification of books according to 12 f.
Subscriptions to books later than books themselves 111 n.: cf. Titles
"Suburbs," renderings of 4
Superlative in elative sense 181 ff.: for comp. 183 f. (πρῶτος, ἔσχατος)
Syllables, shifting of dividing-line between 117: isolation of 132
Symmachus 5, 9, 257 n.
Syncope 99 f.
Syntax affected by imitation of Hebrew 54

Terminations, adjectives of 2 or 3 172: verbal 89, 104 (-τι for -θι), 195, 209 ff.
Testaments of the XII Patriarchs 157 n., 173 n.
Test-words in grouping of books 7 ff.
Text of LXX 1 ff.: cf. New Testament
Theodotion, interpolations in Job from 3 f., elsewhere 158 n. 5: a popular version 5: affinity of style to that of K. βδ 10, of the later historical books 14 f., 55, of 2 Esdras

13, of Ez. ββ 11, (?) Chron. LXX his work xx, 167 n.: Κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων 9: ἐπιστρέφειν 53: ἐγώ εἰμι 55: στῆρ 153: new verbs in -άζω 247: does not use τετράς etc. 189, nor παραγίνομαι 267 n.: literary form in Job Θ 143, late form in do. 280 (ὁραθήσομαι). Cf. Daniel, Transliterations
Theognis 50
"Thus saith the Lord," renderings of, in Jer. 11
Time-statements, literalism in 39 f.
Titles of books later than original work 166 n. (Psalms of Sol.): cf. Psalms, Subscriptions
Titles, official (Egyptian) 156 with n.
Tobit, B text, vernacular style of 24, 25, 28
Towns, declension of names of 167 ff.
Trade-route, proximity to, affects declension of place-names 169
Transcendence of God emphasized in later renderings 8
Transitional forms in the κοινή 18 (οὐθείς), 213 (-οσαν)
Translations and free Greek, contrast in style of 27 f.
Transliterations, in Job Θ 4, in Θ and later LXX books 31 ff., in Pentateuch 31 f.
Tribrach and several short syllables, avoidance of 87 n., 90
Troglodytes in Chron. 167 n.

Uncial MSS, evidence of, in light of papyri 55 ff., etc., suspected 62 ff., 77, 78, 95, 96, 109: birthplaces of 71 f., 100 f.
Uniformity *vice* variety of older language 193, 235, 244

Vaticanus, Codex, comparative value of text for O. T. and N. T. 2 ff.: orthography of (usually older than date of MS) 55 ff., 68 (Psalms), 70, 72, 78 (varies in the different groups), 86, 112, 127 ff. (perhaps late), 188: occasional vulgar (Egyptian) orthogr. (esp. in Isaiah central chaps.) 113, 114 (5 exx.), 147 with n.: plur. of γῆ in 4 K. 143: text in 2 Es. original 237, in Is. interpolated 238
Verbal adjectives 194
Vocabulary, poetical 18, 187 (τέτρασιν), Ionic 285 (-σκορπίζω), Homeric 264 (s. v. δέω), cf. Homer, Ionic: words and forms now literary, ναῦς 152, δεσμά 154, ὄνειρος 155, νίκη 157: new κοινή words, in -εμα 80, γένημα 118, in -άρχης 156, ὀλιγοστός 185: words first found in LXX and "Biblical" words possibly coined by translators, ἐξολεθρεύειν etc. 87 f., ἀθῳοῦν 89, ὀλιγοῦν 112, ἐλαττονεῖν -οῦν 122, 266, εὐθής 178, ἐξώτερος etc. 183, ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι 258, ἐνωτίζεσθαι 267: cf. "Biblical Greek"
Vocative 145 (θεέ)
Voice, middle, replaced by passive 193
Vowels 71 ff.: interchange of 73 ff.: prothetic 97 f., 170 f. n. 4: contraction and syncope 98 ff.: short vowel in tenses of contract vbs. 218 f. Cf. Assimilation
Vulgarisms: see Illiteracy, Sinaiticus

Wisdom, literalism in 43: suggested date of 62: rhythm in 90 f. n.: verbal adjectives in 194 n. Cf. Greek books, Literary books
Wish expressed by question 54
Words, division of 129 f.
Word-formation, retention of unelided vowel 130, and of unassimilated consonant in new compounds 132–134. Cf. Vocabulary
"Writings" or Kethubim, greater freedom allowed in translation of 15

Xenophon, a precursor of the κοινή 17: φυλάσσεσθαι ἀπό 46: ἐγένετο ὥστε (ὡς) 50: 243

Yahweh, abbreviated forms of, in proper names, =-(ε)ίας, -αίας 161

Zaconic, only relic of old dialects 18
Zechariah, χάριτα in 150

II. INDEX OF GREEK WORDS AND FORMS

For the Verbs see § 24.

α, mixture with ε 73 ff.: with η 76 f.: with ο and αι 77: with αυ 79: for αα in proper names 100: -α pure, nouns in 140 ff.: α for η in Ἄννας etc. 143: -α, "Doric" gen. sg. of proper names in 162: -α, place-names in 167 f.

ἀβάκ, ἀβαρκηνείν, ταῖς 33 f.

Ἀβδειού 162

ἀβεδηρείν 33

Ἀβράμ, Ἀβραάμ 100, not Ἄβραμος 160 f.

ἀγαθωσύνη 90

ἀγαθώτερος 184

ἀγαλιᾶσθαι etc. ℵ 120

Ἀγγαῖος 161 n.

ἁγιωσύνη 90

ἁγνία 87

ἀγροῦ (ἀγούρ) 37

ἀεί (αἰεί) 77

ἀέναος (not ἀένν.) 120

ἀεργός in Prov. 173

ἀέρινος 37

-άζω: see -ζω

ἀθωωθήσομαι etc. but ἀθῷος 89, fem. -ῶα 172

αι, interchanged with α 77: with ε 68 f., 77 f.: as short vowel 90 with n. 4: αι loses aug. 199 f.

-αίας, proper names in, G. -ου (and -α) 161 f.

αἰγμάλωτος ℵ 103

Αἴγυπτος ℵ 116

-αίνω, verbs in, keep α in 1 aor. 223 f.: pf. pass. of 224

-αῖος and -ίτης, gentilic names in 171: -αία, names of countries in 170

αἱρετίζειν τὸ πρόσωπον 44

-αίρω, verbs in, keep α in 1 aor. 223

-αις -αι -αισαν, opt. term. 215

αἰσχρότερος 184

ἀκαλλιώμεθα ℵ 102

ἀκάν, τὸν (τὴν) ἄκανα(ν) 157 f.

Ἀκκαρών indecl. 169

ἀκριβία 87

ἀκροβυστία 27

ἀλάβαστρον, τὸ A 153

ἀλαλάζειν -αγμός 37

ἄλας, τὸ and ὁ ἅλς 152

ἀλεεῖς (but ἀλιέων etc.) 84

ἀλλόφυλοι and Φυλιστιείμ 167

ἀλυκός (not ἀλικός) 96

ἀλώπηκες 151

ἄλως (only in form ἄλω) and ἄλων -ωνος, ὁ and ἡ 144 f.

ἅμα = חַם 37

ἀμάξοις ℵ 157

ἁμαρτήσομαι, οὐκ 128

ἀμασενείθ, ἀμαφέθ 33

ἀμβλάκημα, ἀμβλακία 105

Ἀμμανῖτις 170

ἀμνάς, ἀμνός 152

ἄμπελος, ὁ ℵ 145

ἀμφίταπος (not -τάπης) 156

ἀμφότεροι (not ἄμφω) 192

ἄν replaced by ἐάν with δς etc. (not with ἕως, ὅπως, ὡς) 65

ἄν for ἐάν, "if" 99

-αν, 3rd decl. accus. in 146 f.: verbal termination in 209 ff.

ἀνάθεμα -ημα 27 n., 80

ἀνακύμψαι A 110

ἀνὰ μέσον 25: ἀνὰ μ. τῶν ἐσπερινῶν 40

ἀνάπειρος 83

ἀναπηδύει = -πιδ. 85

ἀνάστεμα -ημα 80, -αμα 79 n.

ἀναφάλαντος -θος 104

ἀνδρ(ε)ιώτερος 182

ἀνεξέλεκτος 115

ἀνήρ for ἕκαστος etc., of inanimate things 45 f.

ἄνθρωπος for ἕκαστος etc. 45: ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπος 46

ἀνθ' ὧν 25: in late books ἀνθ' ὧν ὅτι, ἀνθ' ὧν ὅσα 10, 25

ἀνοίει ℵ = ἀνοίγει 113: ἀνοίγειν 127

ἀντάμιμψιν A 110

ἄντικρυς = "opposite" 136

Ἀντιλίβανος beside Λίβανος 166 f. n.

ἀνύγειν 94

ἀνυπνιάζεσθαι ℵ = ἐν. 76

ἀνυπόδετος (for -δητος) 80

ἀνώνητοι = ἀνόν. 90 f.

ἀνώτερον = ἄνω, once ἀνωτέρω 183

ἀπάνωθεν 25, in K. βδ 10

ἀπαρτίζειν in α' 3

ἄπας and πᾶς 138 f.
ἀπηλιώτης 128
ἀπό rare as comparative particle 23: c. φυλάσσεσθαι etc. 46 f.
ἀπογρύψω ℵ 101
ἀποκία B 93
ἀποσκευή of children (=טַף) in Pent. 14
ἄρα = Heb. inf. abs. 47
ἆρ' οὐ, LXX equivalents for 125 f.
Ἀραβά -βώθ 32 f.
ἀράσσω replaced by ῥάσσω 76
ἀρεταλόγος -λογία 76
ἀριθμῷ = "few" 39
ἄριστος 185
ἄρκος for ἄρκτος 116
Ἁρμαθάιμ in 1 K. = Ραμά 168
ἁρμονία = המון 37
ἄρνα, ἀρνός 152 with n.
ἄρουρα for γῆ Ionic 142
ἀρραβών 34, 119
ἄρρην rare, usually ἄρσην 123
ἀρχιεταῖρος 37, 130 n.
ἀρχιευνοῦχος, ἀρχευν. 130 n.
ἄρχοντες = -ας 149
-αρχος and -άρχης 156
Ἀρωδαῖος -δείτης 171
ἀρωδιός ἐρωδ. 76
Ἀρών 100
-ας (-ᾶς), proper names in 163
ἀσεβῆν Aℵ 176
Ἀσηδώθ 33
Ἀσκάλων declined 169
ἄσσει A = ἄλσει 132
ἀσφαλία 87
Ἀταβύριον, Ἰτ. 170 n.
ἀτειχίσταις 172
ἀτός = αὐτός in papyri 79
ἀττέλεβος -λαβος 75
αυ and ευ 78 f.: αυ and α 79: αὐ- loses temp. aug. 200
αὐδῷ = αὐτῷ 103
Αὐραν(ε)ῖτις 170
Αὐσ(ε)ῖτις 170
αὐτός, otiose use of oblique cases of 24: αὐτός, αὐτοῦ 190: αὐτοῦ, ἑαυτοῦ 190
ἀφαίρεμα 80
ἄφεμα 80
ἄφεσις 37
ἀφορίσματα, ἀφωρισμένα = "suburbs" 4 with n.
ἄχι 32 n.
ἀχούχ, τὸν 34
ἀχρεότης ἀχρεοῦν (but ἀχρεῖος) 82
ἄχρι(ς) οὗ 136
ἄχυρος, ὁ (A) and τὸ -ον 153
ἄψεσθε, οὐκ 128
-άω, verbs in, short vowel in tenses of 219: "Attic" fut. replaced by sigmatic 230: confusion with -έω verbs 241 f.

β, euphonic insertion of 111: interchange of with π 105 f.: with μ 106 f.
Βααλείμ (Βεελ-) τῷ 34
Βαβυλών declined 169
Βαδδαργεῖς 170 n.
βαθέου A 179
βάθου 159
βακχούρια 34
βάρβαρος 37
βαρ(ε)ῖα 179: βαρέως -έος 179
βάρις (βᾶρις) 34, 150
βαρρᾶ ℵ = βορρᾶ 77
Βασαν(ε)ῖτις 170
βάσανος, ὁ ℵ 145
βασιλεῖς and -έας 148: βασιέως 114
βασίλειον, τὸ for ἡ βασιλεία etc. 157
βασιλεύειν "make king" 24
βάτος, ὁ 145
βάτραχος, ἡ A 146
Βαχχίδης ℵ 121
βδέλυγμα, βέδεκ 37
βειρά 34
βέλτιστος 185
βέσον, ἀνὰ A 107
βιβλείδιον 87 n.
βιβλιαφόρος -αγράφος 77
βιβλίον, βίβλος (βύβλος), βύβλινος, Βύβλιος 95 f.
βῖκος 34
βιωτεύειν 91
βόας 147
βοββήσει = βομβ. 132
βόθρος 37
βόλιβος A 106
βορρᾶς, rarely βορέας (-ήης) 123 f., 143
Βόσορρα, G. -ας 167
βράματα ℵ = βρώματα 77
βύσσος, βύσσινος 34

γ, omission of, between vowels 111 ff., in γί(γ)νομαι, γιγ(ν)ώσκω etc. 100, 114 f., elsewhere 115: insertion of, in papyri 111 n.: pronunciation of 111, difficult to Egyptians 100 n., 112 n.: interchanged with κ 100 ff.: γκ for κ 101
γαζαρηνός (Γαζ.) 34, 171
γαῖαι 143
γαῖσος, ὁ and τὸ -ον 154
Γαλααδ(ε)ῖτις 170
γαμβρεύειν 262 n.
γαρπῶν A = καρπ. 101
γεδδούρ 33
γειώρας xx, 28, 34
γενεσιάρχης 156
γένημα and γέννημα 118
γῆ, plural of, and substitutes for 143
γῆρας, G. γήρους and -ως, D. γήρει and -ᾳ 149
γίνομαι and γίγν. 114 f.: cf. ἐγένετο and § 24
γινώσκω and γίγν. 114 f.: cf. § 24
γλυκ(ε)ῖα 179
γναφεύς 101

γνήμην A 101
γνόφος, ὁ (and τὸ A) 159
γόμορ = "omer" and "homer" 32
Γόμορρα, G. -ας (not -ων) 168
γόμος 32
γόνα A = γόνατα 152
γονεῖς and -έας 148
γραμματοεισαγωγεύς 130 n.
γυνηγός D = κυν. 101

δ, omission of 114, 116: interchange of, with θ 104 f.: with τ 100
δάγνοντες A 101
Δαμάσεκ 167
δασέως -έος 179
δασύπους for λαγώς 145
Δαυείδ (not Δαβίδης) 160 f.
δεβραθά 33
-δειγνύω A 101
δεκάδαρχος LXX, -άρχης Joseph. 156: δεκάταρχος ℵ 103 f.
δεκάδυο and δώδεκα 187 f.
δένδρον, G. -ου, D. -ει and -ῳ 160
δέομαι = בְּ in Pent. 14
δεσμοί and (lit.) δεσμά 154
διακλέπτεσθαι c. inf. *vice* adv. 54
διάστεμα -ημα 80
διδόναι = τιθέναι 39: cf. § 24
δίδραγμον (late MSS) 103
διευτύχει in papyri 57 n.
δικαιωσύνη A 90
διότι and ὅτι 138 f.
δίφορον 99
διχηλεῖν (not δίχαλον) 76
δίψα, δίψος 157
διῶρυξ -υγος (and -υχος) 150 f.
δολεία A = δουλ. 91
δόμα and δόσις 79
δόξεως ℵ 158
δουλεύειν and λατρεύειν 8
δουλία 87
δοῦλος and synonyms 7 f.
δραγμή (late MSS) = δραχμή 103
δυνάμεων, Κύριος τῶν 9
δυναστ(ε)ία 69
δύο, G. δύο, D. δύο and usually δυσίν 187, or δυσί 135: lit. δυεῖν (-οῖν) 92, 187: δύο δύο 54
δυσεβήσ = δυσσ. 120
δῶναι for δοῦναι 91

ε, mixture with ᾰ 75 f.: with αι 68 f., 77 f.: with η 79 ff., aug. 198 f.: with ει 81 f.: with ι 84 f.: with ο 87 ff.: with υ, ευ 97
ἐαλωκυίης ℵ 140
ἐάν, ὃς 65 ff.
ἑαυτοῦ, αὐτοῦ 190: ἑαυτ. for 1 and 2 sg. illiterate ib.: but ἑαυτῶν for all 3 persons of pl. 190 f.
ἐγ for ἐκ 101
ἐγ γαστρί A 72, 131
ἐγγίζειν (συν-) c. gen. 167 n.
ἔγγονος for ἔκγονος 101
ἐγγὺς ἀπὸ προσώπου in Θ 47
ἐγγύτατοι, ἔγγιστα 182
ἐγένετο ἐγίνετο etc., constructions with 50 ff.
ἔγνοι ℵ = ἔγνω etc. 93
ἐγώ εἰμι with finite verb in late books and Hexapla 10, 30, 55
Ἐδώμ, Ἰδουμαία 167
Ἔξρας A 111
ἐθνάρχης 156
ἔθνου A 160
ει, mixture with ε 81 ff.: with η 83 f., aug. εἰ- and ἠ- 201 f.: with ῑ (ῐ) 85 ff.: with οι 92
εἰ = negat. in adjurations 54: εἰ (εἰ) μήν, ἦ μήν, εἰ μή 54, 83 f.
-εια and -ία, nouns in 68 f., 87
-είας, proper names in, G. -ου and -α 161 f.
εἰκάς and εἰκοστή 189
εἰκόνα, καθ' 127
εἴκοσι (not -σιν) 135
εἴληφα aoristic 24
εἴλκυσεν, οὐκ 128
εἶν (ἶν) 32
εἵνεκεν, οὗ 82
εἴξουσιν, ἤξουσιν v. ll. 85
εἰρήνη, Hebraic uses of 40 f.
-εις, proper names in 164
εἰς (not ἐς) 82
εἷς as indef. article 54: εἷς (πρῶτος) καὶ εἰκοστός 189
-εισαν for -εσαν in plpf. 216
-είτης -εῖτις : see -ίτης -ις
ἐκ- : see ἐξ-
ἕκαστος for ἑκάτερος 192: substitutes for and distribution of 45, 192
ἑκάτερος 192
ἑκατόνταρχος LXX, -άρχης N.T. and Joseph. 156
ἐκεῖ and ἥκει v. ll. 81
ἐκεῖνος (not κεῖνος) 97
ἑκθές A = ἐχθές 102
ἑκθρός, ἑκχθρός etc. 102
ἑκκαίδεκα B, ἓξ καὶ δέκα A 188
ἐκκλησία first in Dt. 14
ἑκπᾶν = ἐκσπᾶν 117
ἐκφεύξασθαι = -εσθαι 76
ἑκών, οὐκ 128
ἐλάσσων, ἐλάχιστος 185: ἐλάττων, ἐλαττοῦν, ἐλαττονεῖν etc. 121 n., 122
ἔλαφος 37 n.
ἐλαφρότερος 182
ἔλεος, τὸ and ὁ, and meanings of 158 with n.
ἔλεον = ἔλαιον 78
ἐλέφανσιν 151

ἐλεφαντάρχης 156
ἔλος and ὄρος, mixture of 107
ἐλπίς 124 f.
-εμα and -ημα 79 f.
ἐμαυτόν, καθ' 127
Ἐμεκαχώρ 33
ἐμέν ℵ 135, 147
ἐμ μέσῳ mainly in A 72, 131
ἐμπεποδεστάτη A 182
ἐν, ἐν ἐμοί = בְּ in late books (else δέομαι) 14: = εἰς 25: c. εὐδοκεῖν, θέλειν etc. 47, of accompanying circumstances ib.: compounds of, assimilation in 132 f.
ἐναντίον and ἔναντι 25, 43, 68 n.
ἔνατος (not ἔνν.) 120
ἐνδεδοίκει = -δύκει 94
ἔνεδρον (and ἐνέδρα) 156
ἕνεκα, ἕνεκεν, οὗ εἵνεκεν 82 f., 135: οὐκ ἕνεκεν 128
ἔνι = ἔνεστι 257
ἐνιαυτόν, καθ' 125
ἔννηα A 81
ἐνταῦτα A 104: ἐντεῦθα A 79
ἐντότερος A 183 n.
ἐντράπητι 104
ἐνύπνιον supplants ὄνειρος 155
ἔνυστρον for ἦν. 81
ἐνώπιον 25, 42 f.
ἐξ- (ἐκ-), causative force of, in composition: see Ind. I Causative
ἐξαβά = ἐκ Σαβά 130
ἐξαμαρτάνειν 24
ἐξελεθρεύειν 88 n.
ἐξελέσθαι ἐπί τινα in Θ 47
ἐξερεύεσθαι = -ερευγ. 113
ἐξέφνης 78
ἐξεχώρησεν A = -εχώρισεν 85
ἐξολεθρεύειν and -ολοθρ. etc. 87 f.
ἐξοῦ = ἐκ σοῦ 130
ἐξουδενοῦν (-ουθενοῦν) and ἐξουθενεῖν (-ουδενεῖν) 105 with n.
ἐξ σκηνωμάτων ℵ 130
ἐξώτερος, -τατος 183
ἐπαισχύνεσθαι τὸ πρόσωπον 44
ἐπαναστρέφειν in Pent. 13 f.
ἐπανέρχεσθαι c. inf. 53
ἐπάνω, ἐπάνωθεν 25
ἐπελάθεντο 88 f., 216
ἐπεστώς, ἐπίσταται = ἐφ. 128
ἐπί c. dat. = phrase with בְּ 44: c. φείδεσθαι etc. 47
ἐπιβεβηκυίης 140
ἐπιλεύεσθαι = ἐπελεύσεσθαι 114
ἐπιστρέφειν *vice* πάλιν 53
ἐπιφανῆν ℵ 176
ἑπτάκι 136
ἐραυνάω ἐρευνάω 78 f.
ἐρεμάζων A for ἠρ. 81
ἔρρωσο, ἐρρῶσθαι εὔχομαι in papyri 57 n.
ἐρωτᾶν (ἐπερ.) εἰς εἰρήνην 40
-ες for -ας, in acc. plur. 148 f.: in 2 sg. 1 aor. and pf. 215 f.
-εσαν *vice* -ον 89, 213
Ἔσδρας ℵ 111
-εσθα 218
ἔσομαι διδόναι 24
ἐσπέλας ℵ 108: ἔσπερος A 157
Ἔσρας B 111
ἔσται, καί, introductory formula 52
-έστατος, superlatives in, literary 182
ἑστηκυίης ℵ 140
ἐσχατογήρως, indeclinable 173
ἔσχατος -ον = "latter," "after" 184
ἔσχηκα, aoristic 24
ἔσω (not εἴσω) 82
ἐσώτερος, -τατος, ἐσώτερον = ἔσω 183
ἕτερος (μηθέτ.) 192: substitutes for 45
ἔτος 124 f.
ευ, mixture with αυ 78 f.: with ε and υ 97: εὐ- loses temp. aug. 200
εὐδοκεῖν ἐν 47
-εύειν, verbs in, used causatively 24
εὐθής, εὐθύς (εὐθεῖος) 177 ff.
εὔθρασος 79
εὕρεμα 80
εὑρίσκω *sic* 129
-εύς, nouns in, acc. plur. of 147 f.: mixture with nouns in -ής 153 n.
εὐσεβῆν 176
εὐτύχει in papyri 57 n.
εὐφραίνειν, augment 68
εὐωδία for εὐοδία 91
ἐφ-, causative in ἐφαμαρτάνειν 259
ἐφιορκεῖν -ία 126
ἔφισος 126
ἐφίδιος αἰφ. 78
ἐφούδ, ἐφώδ 33
ἐχ for ἐκ 103
ἐχθές (not χθές) 97
ἔχθεσις = ἔκθεσις 103
ἔχθιστος, lit. 185
ἐχόμενος for παρά 25
ἔχρος 116
ἔψεμα -ημα 80
-έω, verbs in, short vowel in tenses of 218 f.: Att. fut. replaced by sigmatic 230: confusion with -άω verbs 241 f.: contraction in 242 f.: mixture with -ω verbs 243 f.
ἕως, prep., Hebraic use of, in Θ 47: ἕως ᾅδου in Jer. β 14, 37
ἕως, "dawn" 145

ζ, altered pronunciation of, causing mixture with σ 108
ζεύη א = ξεύγη 113
ζῆλος, ὁ (and τὸ) 158
ζιβύνη 108
ζμύρνα א, ζσμάραγδος א 108
ζυγός, ὁ (and τὸ ζύγον) 154
-ζω (-άζω, -ίζω), new verbs in 194, 247: tenses formed with σ or ξ 222 f., fut. in -ῶ and -σω 228 ff.
ζωῆ ζήσῃ 49

η and ε 79 ff., augm. ἡ- for ἐ- 197 f.: η and ει 83 f., -η -ει -ασαι in 2 sg. mid. 217 f.: η and ι 85: η and υ 96 f.
ῆ μήν: see εἶ μήν
ἡδύς, mixture with ἴδιος 126, cf. 85
ἧκει and ἐκεῖ v. ll. 81: ἥκειν for ἧκ. 128
ἠκούμενος A = ἤγ. 102
Ἡλ(ε)ιού and Ἡλ(ε)ίας 162
-ημα and -εμα 79 f.
ἡμέραι, Hebraic uses of 39 f.
ἤμισυς and ἥμυσυς 95: becoming an indeclinable, G. ἡμίσους 179 f.: ἡμισ(ε)ία 179
ἡνίκα in K. βδ 10: ἡν. ἐάν 65, 66 n.
-ής and -εύς, mixture of nouns in 153 n.: -ης (-ής), adjectives in, A. -ῆν 175 ff.: -ῆς, proper names in 163 f.
ἡσυχάζειν 128
ἠττᾶσθαι, ἥττων 121 n., 122
ἠχή, replaced by ὁ (and τὸ) ἦχος 157, 159

θ interchanged with δ in οὐθείς (μηθ.) 58 ff., elsewhere 104 f.: with τ 104: omission of 116, in 1 aor. pass. (ἐκρύφην) 236, 237 n.: θθ for τθ 121
Θαιμαν(ε)ῖτις 170
θάλασσα = תַּעֲלָה 37
θάμβος, ὁ and τὸ 158
θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖται 48
θαρρεῖν and θαρσεῖν, etc. 123
θᾶττον and τάχιον 184
θαυμάζειν τὸ πρόσωπον 43 f.
θαυμαστοῦσθαι c. inf. 54
θεείμ, τὸ 34
θέλειν ἐν 47
θέμα and compounds 80
θεμέλιος and -ον 154
θεός, V. θεέ 145
θεραπεία 33, 37
θεραπεύειν 8 n.
θεράπων 7 f.
θεραφείν (-πειν) θαρ. 33
θῖβις 34, 150
θυγάτερες = -ας 149: θυγατῆρος א 151
θυρεωφόρος 90
Θῶυθ and Θώθ in papyri 163 n.

ι, mixture with ε 84 f.: with ει 85 ff.: with η 85: with οι 92: insertion of, between ο and another vowel 93: unpronounced in diphthong υι 141
-ία and -εία 68 f.
Ἰαμείν 33
-ίας, proper names in, G. -ίου (and -ία) 161 f.
ἶβις (εἶβ.) 150
ἰδεῖν, ἀφιδεῖν etc. 124 f.
ἴδιος, ἴδ., ἤδ., mixture with ἡδύς 85, 126
ἰδού 55: οὐχ ἰδού and οὐκ ἰδ. 70, 125 f.
Ἰδουμαία, Ἐδώμ 167, 170
ἱερατία 87
ἱερεῖς = עֲרֵשׁ 37: acc. plur. 148
Ἱερμίας 100
Ἱεροσόλυμα and Ἱερουσαλήμ 168
-ίζω: see -ζω
Ἰηρεμίας 81
Ἰησοῦς, declension of 164 f.
Ἰκανός in Θ 4
ἴκτερα 160
ἴλεως = חִלֵּיל 38 with n.: indeclinable 173
ἰλικία -ιώτης A 85
ἵνα, elision of final letter of 137: ἵνα clause = inf. rare 24, 194
Ἰουδάς 127: G. -α and -ου, and indecl. Ἰουδά 163
Ἰουμαία = Ἰδουμαία 114
ἵππαρχος and -άρχης 156
ἱππεῖς, acc. pl. 148
-ις, Egyptian words in 150: -ις, -(ε)ῖτις, place-names in 169 f.
Ἰσάκ 100
ἴσος 126
Ἴσχυρος, ὁ in Θ 4: ἴσχυρος 127
Ἰταβύριον, τό 170
-ίτης (-είτης) and -αῖος, gentilic names in 171
Ἰτουραῖοι, Τουρ. 171 n.
ἰχθύας (-ῦς) 147
-(ί)ων -ιστος 184 ff.
Ἰωσείας, G. -α and -ου 162
Ἰώσηπος, Ἰώσηφος 106

κ, interchanged with γ 100 ff.: omission of 115: doubling of, κξ = ξ 120: κ + σ amalgamated into ξ 130
κάβος 34
καθαρίζω, ἐκαθέρισα etc. 74
κάθεμα 80
καθηκυίης in papyri 142
κάθιδρος 173
καθίζειν γυναῖκα 262 n.

κάθοδος in *α'* 3, 190
καθόπισθεν 104
καί, coordination of sentences with 55: crasis in *κἀγώ* etc. 99, 137 f.: *καί γε* in K. *βδ* etc. 10, 37: *καὶ μάλα* in K. *βδ* 10
κακουχεῖν in *α'* 3
κάλλυνθρον 104
κάλος for *κάλως* 145
καλῶς ποιήσεις γράψεις (or *γράψας*) 51 n.
καμμύειν 99
κανοῦν 144
Κάρμηλος, Χερμέλ 167: Καρμήλιον ὄρος 171
καρπάσινος 34 n.
Καρχηδών *-δόνιοι* = Tarshish 167 n.
κασία 34
κασσιδέριον א 103
κατά, c. acc. = על פי etc. 44
καταγάζειν 79
κατάλημμα = *-λειμμα* 84
καταράκτης 118
κατάστεμα 80
Καταχρύσεα 173
κατερόμβευσεν (*-ρέμβ.*) 88
κατορτώθη 104
κατώτερον = *κάτω*, *κατωτάτω* 183
Κεδρών, *τῶν κέδρων*, *χειμάρρους* 38, 169
κειράδας in Jer. *β* 38
κέρας, declension of 149
Κεχάρ, *τὸ* 167
κῆν A = *γῆν* 102
κιβωτός 35
κιννάμωμον 35
κινύρα 35
Κιτιεῖς, Κίτιοι, Κιτιαῖοι 171
κιτών 103
κλείς κλεῖδα (not *κλεῖν*) 150
κλίβανος (not *κρίβ.*) 107
κλῖμα 79
κλοιός, *ὁ* and (A) *τὸ -ὸν* 155
κοθωνοί 36
κολλ(ο)υρίς -ίζειν etc. 92
κολοκαύει = *κολακεύει* 79
κολόκυνθα -κυντα for *-κύντη* 104, 143
Κοργίας A 102
κόρη κόραν 142 f.
κόρος 35
κοῦφος for *κούφη* 172
κραγή א = *κραυγή* 113
κράτιστος 185
κραυή א = *κραυγή* 113
κρέας 149
κρείσσων, *κρείττων* 121 n., 122
κρῖμα 79
κριός 37 n.
κύαθος 75
κύθρα (= *χύτρα*), *κυθρόποδες* 103
κύκλῳ 25
κύμινον 35
κυνηγός (not *-αγ.*) 76: cf. *γυν.*
κυνομυῖης 140
Κυπριάρχης 156
Κυρήνηνδε in *α'* 3
κωλύειν = כלא 38
κωμάρχης 156
κωπελάται A for *-ηλ.* 81

λ, effect of, on vowels 73, 76, 78, 81, 84, 86, 88, 97: omission of 114, 116: λ and *ρ* 107 f.: λλ and λ 119 f.
λαγχάνειν = לכר 38
λαγώς unused 145
λακάνη A 76
λαλιᾶς, *περί* in Aquila 41
λαμβάνειν τὸ πρόσωπον 44
λάμπας = לפיד 38
λάμψασιν A = *λάψ.* 110
λαός for *λεώς* 145
λατρεύειν and *δουλεύειν* 8
λατρία 87
λέγειν, *τῷ* in *α'* 3: *λέγων -οντες* without construction 23: *λέγοντες* v. l. for *λέοντες* 113
λεῖ א, *λέκι* א = *λέγει* 113, 102
Λεύ(ε)ις and Λευ(ε)ί 164
λῆμμα = *λεῖμμα* 84
λήμψομαι etc. 108 f.
ληνός, *ἡ* (and *ὁ*) 146
λίβανος 35
Λίβανος and Ἀντιλιβ. 166 f. n.
λίθος, *ὁ* in all senses 146
λίμος, *ὁ* and *ἡ* 146
-λιμπάνω (Ionic) 110 n.
λιχμωμένους = *λικ.* 103
λόγου, *περὶ* in *α'* 41: *λόγος* v. l. for *λαός* 113
λοιμαίνεσθαι = *λυμ.* 94
λοιμός -ή as adj. "pestilent" 172
λυκνία 103
λυτρῶνας = *λουτ.* 92
λύχνοι 155

μ, effect of, on vowels 84, 86, 97: *μ* and *β* (*π*) 106 f.: omission of 114: insertion of, before labial 100, 108 ff.
-μα and *-σις*, words in 79
Μαββαρ(ε)ῖτις Μαββ. 170
Μαδιαν(ε)ῖτης, Μαδιηναῖος 171
Μαθθάν etc. 121
Μακεδών, gentilic name declined, = Megiddo indecl. 102, 169
μάλιστα 185
Μαμβρή 111
μάν, *μάννα* 32
μαναά, *μααvά*, *μανάχ* etc. 33
Μανασσῆς and indecl. *-ή* 164
μανδραγόρας -γορος 157: pl. *μανδράγορες* A 158
μανδύας 35
μανιάκης 35 n.
μάρσιππος -ιον 35, not *μαρσύπιον* 96
μαρυκᾶσθαι but *μηρυκισμός* 76
Μάσεκ 33
μασθός 104
μάστιγξ for *-ιξ* 115, 151

μάχαιρα -ης -ῃ 141 f.
μεγαλοπρέπ(ε)ια 69
μεγαλύνειν, c. inf. 54
μεγάλως = מְעֹלִי 38
μέγιστος, lit. and elative 185
Μεισώρ 33
Μειχαίας, G. -α and -ου 162
μεριδάρχης 156
Μέρρα, G. -ας 168
μες ℵ 190
μεσοπωρῶν = -πορῶν 91
μεταξύ, substitute for 25: written μετοξύ in A 77
μέχρι, Hebraic use of, in Θ 47: μέχρι(ς) οὗ etc. 136
μηθείς and μηδείς 58 ff.
μηθέτερος 61 n.
μιερός, μιεροφαγεῖν etc. 75
μικός ℵ 116
μισει = ἥμισυ 180 n. 9
μνᾶ 35
μογ(γ)ιλάλος 120 f.
μοκλός B 102
μόλιβος, μόλιβδος, μόλυβος 96, 116: μόλιμος 106
μολλον ℵ = μᾶλλον 77
μονογενῆν A 176
μυελός but μυαλοῦν 75
μύες, μύας and μῦς 147
μυσερός 75
Μωαβ(ε)ῖτις 170
μῶμος = מוּם 38
Μωυσῆς and Μωσῆς 163 n.: two forms of declension of 163 f.

ν, effect on vowels of 84, 86: omission of 114, 117: νῦ ἐφελκυστικόν 134 f., irrational final ν 135, 143 f. (βορρᾶν ℵ = gen.), 146, 216: doubling of, in verbs in -νω 225 f.
νάβλα 35
Ναγέβ 33
ναός for νεώς 145
νάρδος 35
ναῦς (lit. word) νηός νῆας 152
νέβελ 33
Νεεμίας, G. -α and -ου 162: Νεέμιος 161 n.
νεκρομαῖον in α′ 3
νέοττος, νεοσσός, νοσσός etc. 98
νεώτερος (=superl.) 181, -ώτατος 182
νῆσσος 117, 120
νῖκος, τὸ and (lit.) ἡ νίκη 157
νίτρον (not λίτρον) 35
νουμηνία and νεομ. 98: νομηνία A 91
νοῦς, G. νοός 160
νυνί 191
νῶτος, νῶτοι (and νῶτα) 155

ξ for κ + σ 130: for σ in tenses of verbs in -ζω 222 f.
ξολοθρεύω, mod. Gr. 88

ο, mixture with α 77: with ε 87 ff.: with υ (ου) 91: with οι 93: with ω 89 ff., 194, 198 f. (loss of aug.)
Ὀβδειού 162
ὅδε, uses of 191: οἵδε, αἵδε in Jer. β 14, 37
ὁδηγεῖν -ός (not -αγ.) 76
ὁδύρεσθαι 97
οι, interchanged with ι 92: with ει 92: with ο 93: with ω 93, 256: with υ 93 f.: for ου in ℵ 244: οἰ- loses aug. 200
οἶγον A 101
οἶδας, οὐχ 125
οἰκέτης 7
οἴμμοι, ὄμμοι 120
-οῖν, inf. in 244
οἰνοφρυγεῖν 107
-οισαν 215
οἰφ(ε)ί 32
ὀκ ὀχ ℵ for οὐκ οὐχ 91
ὀκία B 93
ὅλεθρος (not -οθ.) 88
ὀλίγος 126 f.: ὀλίος, ὀλιοστός, ὀλιοῦν 112: ὀλιγοστός 185
ὁλολύζειν -υγμός 37
ὁλοσφύρητος 141
ὁμείρεσθαι 97
Ὀμμόθ 33
ὁμόεθνος A for -εθνής 181
ὄμορα 4 n.
ὄνειροι 155
ὀξ(ε)ῖα for ὀξέα 179
ὀπίσω, ζητεῖν, in Θ 47
ὄρειον 87
ὀρθος (ὀρθίζειν) = ὄρθρ. 116
ὁρμή, ὅρμος 38
ὄρνεον (ὀρνίθιον) replaces ὄρνις 153
ὄρος and ἔλος, mixture of 107: ὀρέων 151
-ος, masc. and neut., interchange of nouns in 158 ff.
ὅς ἄν and ὅς ἐάν 65 ff.
-οσαν 209 ff.
ὅσπερ, lit. 192
ὅστις 192
ὀστοῦν -τᾶ but ὀστέου etc. 144
ὀσφρασία 76
ὀσφύας (-ῦς) 147
ὅτι in adjurations 54: ὅτι and διότι 138 f.
ου, interchanged with ο and ω 91: with υ 92
οὗ εἵνεκεν replaces οὕνεκα 82
οὐαί = אוֹי etc. 38
οὐθείς and οὐδείς 58 ff., 100, 104: οὐθὲν ἧττον = Heb. inf. abs. 47
οὐκ and οὐχ 125–129: οὐκ ἰδού and οὐχ ἰδού 70, 125 f.
Οὐλαμμαΐς, Οὐλαμαΐς 33
-οῦς, proper names in 164 f.: declension -οῦς -οῦτος in papyri (not LXX) 165 n.: contracted adjectives in 172 f.

οὖς, ἀποκαλύπτειν τὸ 43
-οῦσαν 214
οὕτω(s) 136: οὕτως εἶπεν Κύριος in Jer. β 11
ὀφθαλμός, Hebraic uses of 43
ὀφρύας (-ῦς) 147
ὄψομαι, οὐχ 125
-οω, verbs in 244

π, interchanged with β 105 f.: with φ 106: with μ 107: euphonic insertion of 110
παγίς, πακίς = פַּח 38, 102
πάγος, ὁ and τὸ 159
πάθμη ℵ, πάθνη ℵ (= φάτνη) 106
παιδίον = πεδίον 69, 78
παῖς Κυρίου 7 f.
πακίς: see παγίς
παλαίστρη 141
παλαιώτερος -ώτατος 182
πάλιν, Hebraic substitutes for 52 f.
παλλακή 35
παν-, compounds of 134
πάνδες = πάντες 103
πανουργεύω (not -έω), -ευμα (v. l. -ημα) 96
Παντοκράτωρ, Κύριος 9
πάντως = Heb. inf. abs. 47
παρά, c. acc. in comparison 23: c. dat. = "in the estimation of" rare 43
παραγίνομαι, as synonym for ἔρχομαι 267 n.
παρράσιν = πατρ. 132
πᾶς τις, substitutes for 45: πᾶς and ἅπας 138 f.: πᾶν = πάντα 173 ff., πάντα ℵ = πᾶν 175
πάσχα beside φάσεκ 32
πάταρχος = πατρ. 116
πάτμωμα ℵ 106
πατριάρχης 156
παχνί (mod. Gr.) 106 n.
πέλυξ for πέλεκυς 153
πεντέκοντα A 81
πέντες A = πάντες 75
πεπτωκώς = -κός 90
περί, substitutes for 25: περὶ λαλιᾶς (λόγου) in α′ 41
περικύκλῳ 25
περισπόρια 4
περίσσιος ℵ 181
περίχωρος τοῦ Ἰορδάνου 167
πέταυρον -ευρον 79
πῆχυς, πήχεος (-εως), πηχῶν (-εων) 151
πιεῖν and π(ε)ῖν 63 f.
πί(μ)πλημι, πί(μ)πρημι 110
πιρί ℵ = περί 84
πλείων, πλεῖστος 185: πλέον 81 f.
πλευρά and -όν 157
πληθύνειν, c. inf. (or part.) for adverb 53 f.
πληθύς for πλῆθος 153
πλημμελία (not -εια) 87
πλήρης, becoming indeclinable 176 f.
πλησιέτερον -έστ. -ότ. 182
πλοῖον replaces ναῦς 152
πλοῦτος, ὁ (and τὸ) 159
πλώιμος πλόιμος 90 n.
πόα, ποία 93
ποεῖν ℵ 93
πολλοστός 185
πολύς, nt. in A πολύν 181
πολυτελῆν ℵ 176
πόμα 79
πόρρω (not πρόσω) 123
πότερος replaced by τίς 192
πραύς, πραύτης (not -ος -ότης) 91, 180 f.: πραδέων ℵ = πραέων 114
πρεσβύτης and πρεσβευτής 97
προάστια 4 n.
πρόιμος (not πρώιμος) 90 with n.
πρὸς ταῦτα 44: πρός c. dat. with numerals in 2 Macc. 188
προσήξει and -έξει v. ll. 81
προστιθέναι (-τίθεσθαι) vice πάλιν 52 f.
πρόστόμα 130
πρόσωπον, θαυμάζειν (λαμβάνειν etc.) 43 f.
πρότερος for πρό 183
προυφάνησαν 138
προφθάνειν, construction with 54
πρωινός (not προινός) 90 with n.
πρῶτος for πρότερος 24, 183: εἰκοστός πρῶτος etc. 189: πρῶτος φίλος 37
πτύελ(os) 75
πτωχία 87
πυεῖν in papyri 93 n.
πύλοις 157: πύλει and πύλεσιν A 158
πυρρός 123

ρ, assimilating effect of, on vowels 73 f., 76 bis, 78, 81, 84, 86, 88, 97, 176, 219: on consonants 106 n.: interchanged with λ 107 f.: omission of 114, 116: reduplication of, (ῥεριμμένος) 204 f.: ρρ and ρ 118 f.: ρρ and ρσ 123 f.
-ρᾶ, nouns in 140 ff.
ῥάβδος, ὁ A 145
Ῥάγα and Ῥάγαι 168
Ῥάθυμος = Rehum 161 n.
Ῥαμά and Ἀρμαθάιμ 168
ῥάσσω = ἁράσσω 76
ῥάχις = רַק 38
ῥῆμα = דָּבָר 41
ῥητός in Ex. 41
ῥοών = Rimmon 38
ῥύπος, ὁ (and τὸ) 159

σ, interchanged with ζ 108: omission of 114, 117, in ἅλω acc. plur. 145: final s in οὕτω(s) etc. 136: irrational final s 216: insertion and omission of, in

pass. tenses 219 ff.: *σσ* and *ττ* 100, 121 ff.
σαβαώθ, Κύριος 9, 33
σάββατον -τα, D. *-τοις* and *-σιν*, *σαββατίζειν* 35
σαβέκ 33
-σαι, 2 sg. mid. term. 217 f.
σάκκος 36
Σαλωμών, Σαλομών, Σολομών, orthography and declension 161, 165 f.
Σαμαρ(ε)ῖτις 170
σαμβύκη 36
Σαμψών 110
Σαναμάσσαρος 106
σάπτιγγος ℵ = *σάλπ.* 132
σάπφειρος 36: *σάππειρος* 121
σαράκοντα, Cod. E 63 n.
σάραξ ℵ 98
Σαραπιεῖον -πεῖον 64
Σαρᾶπις, *Σεραπις* 74
σαραφεῖν ℵ 76
σαυτοῦ, *σεαυτοῦ* 190
Σαυχαῖος, *Σαυχίτης* 171
Σαφφάν, *Σαφφώθ* etc. 121
Σεδεκίας, G. *-ου* and *-α* 162
Σ(ε)ιδών, declined 169
Σειών in Jer. *β* 38
σευτλίον 123
Σεφηλά 33
Σηδαμείν = Zidonians 167
σήσματι = *σείσματι* 84
σιβύνη, *ζιβ.* etc. 108
σιδηρέας ℵ 173
σίελος -ίζειν (not *σίαλος*) 75: *ὁ σ.* and *τὰ σίελα* 155
σίκερα 33
Σίκιμα 33, beside *Συχέμ* 167 f.
σίκλος (not *σίγλος*) 36
σικυήρατον -ήλατον 107
σιμίδαλις Aℵ = *σεμ.* 84
σινδών 36
σιρώνων 36
-σις and *-μα*, nouns in 79
σῖτος, *σῖτα* 155
σκληρύνειν, c. inf. 54
σκνίψ 106
σκόρδον 99
σκότος, *τὸ* (not *ὁ*) 159
σμάραγδος 108
σμιρίτης λίθος 96
σμύρνα 108
Σόδομα, G. *-ων* 168
Σολομών: see *Σαλωμών*
Σομόηλος = *Σαμουήλ* 165 n.
Σομορών, *Σεμερών* = *Σαμαρ(ε)ία* 90, 167
Σόρ beside *Τύρος* 167
Σουσάννα -νης 161
σπεῖρα, G. *-ης* 141 f.
σπόνδυλος ℵ 106
στάδιον -ους 155
σταθμοί (not *-μά*) 155
στάμνος, *ὁ* 146
σταφίς (not *ἀστ.*) 97
στάχυς (not *ἀστ.*) 97: acc. pl. *στάχυας* and *-υς* 147
στῆρ Θ for *στέαρ* 153
στίβι, *στῖμι* etc. 107
στίχος (not *στοῖχ.*), *στιχίζειν* 92
στόμα, "Hebraic" 44
στρατιῶν, *Κύριος τῶν* in *α'* 9
σύ and *σοί*, interchangeable 94
συγγενεῦσι 153
συκάμινος 36
συκοφαντεῖν 38
σύμπας (*σύνπας*) 133 with n.
σύν, in *α'* 3: not *ξύν* 108: compounds of, assimilation in 133 f.
συναγωγή = קהל 14
συνδιάσω = *-δυ.* 94
συνέβη, c. inf. 52 with n.
σύνθεμα -ημα 80
συνιέναι ἐπί Θ 47
συνκυροῦντα 4
σύστεμα -ημα 80
σφῦρα -ης -η 141
Σωμωρών 90
σῷοι = *σῶαι* 172
Σωρείν = Tyrians 167

τ, omission of 114, 116: interchange of, with *δ* 100, 103 f.: with *θ* 104: *ττ* and *σσ* 121 ff.
τάδε λέγει Κύριος in Jer. *α* 11
ταλαμών A 76
ταμιεῖον and *ταμ(ε)ῖον* 63 ff.
ταραχή and *τάραχος*, *ὁ* and *τὸ* 159
τάσσαρας ℵ 76
-τατος, superlatives in 182 f.
ταφνοῦν A = *φατνοῦν* 106
τάχιον and *θᾶττον* (not *ταχύτερον*) 184
ταχύνειν, c. inf. 54
τέγος 117
τειχέων and *-ῶν* 151: *τῖχον* A 160
τέκτονες = *-ας* 149
τέλεον, *τελέως*, *τέλειος -εισῦν* 82
τέλος, *εἰς* = Heb. inf. abs. 47
τεμένου A 160
τέρμινθος, *τερέμ.*, *τερέβ.* 106 f.
τεσσαράκοντα, *τεσσεράκοντα* 62 f., 73 f.
τεσσαρισκαιδέκατος 189
τέσσερα etc. 62, 73 f.: *τέσσαρες* = *τέσσαρας* 73 f, 148 f.: *τέσσερας* = *τέσσαρες* 74: dat. *τέρσαρσιν* A, *τεσσάροις* A, *τέτρασιν* 160, 187
τετελευτηκυίη 140
τετράπεδος -ποδος -πους 88 with n.
τέτρας and *τετάρτη* 189 with n.
-τι for *-θι* 104
τιμωρίαν in Jer. *β* 38
τις, *ἀνήρ* replaces 45
τίς replaces *πότερος* 192: *τίναν* ℵ 147
τοιοῦτος, nt. *-ο* and *-ον* 192

τόκος = תך 38
τόλμην 143
τοπάζιον = פז 38
τοπάρχης 156
τοσοῦτος, nt. *-ο* and *-ον* 192
Τουραῖος, Ἰτ. 171
τόχοις B = *τοίχ.* 93
τραματίαι 79
τριακάς 189
τρίβος, *ἡ* and *ὁ* 146
τρισκαιδέκατος 188 f.
τύμπανον = תף 38
Τύρος and Σόρ 167
Τωβ(ε)ίας, G. *-α* and *-ου* 162
Τώβεις *-ειν* 164

υ, variety in pronunciation of, in the *κοινή* 92 n., 236 n.: interchange with *η* (*ε*) 96 f.: with *ευ* 97: with *ο* 91: with *ου* 92: with *οι* 93 f.: loses asp. 129
ὕαλος 75
-ύας vice -ῦς 147
ὑγίεια, *ὑγ(ε)ία* 63 f.
ὑγιῆ(ν) (not *ὑγιᾶ*) 176
-ύην replaces *-υν* 235
υι, *ι* unpronounced in 141
-υια, *-υῖα*, decl. of words in 140 f.
υἱός, Hebraic uses of 41 f.
ὑμ(ῶν) αὐτ(ῶν) and *ὑμῖν ἑαυτοῖς* in Hex. 191
-ύνω, pf. pass. of verbs in 224
ὑπέρ for *περί* 25: in comparison 181
ὑπεράνω 25
ὑπερδεῖν = *ὑπεριδεῖν* 99
ὑπόκατω 25
ὑπόστεμα -ημα 80
ὑποτίθθια 121
ὑποχρέως 173
-υς, *-ύς*, adjectives in 177 ff.
ὕσσωπος, *ὁ* and *ἡ* 146
ὕστερος -τατος, rare 184

ὕψου א 160
ὕω, *ὑετίζω* 262

φ and *π*, interchange of 106: *φφ* for *πφ* 121
φακός = פך 38
φάλαγξ and *φάραγξ*, mixture of 107
φαλέτρας 108
φάραξ א 115
φάσεκ, *φάσεχ* 32
φατμοῦν, *φάτμωμα* 106
φάτνη etc., various spellings of 106
φείδεσθαι ἐπί 47
φεύειν א = *φεύγειν* 113
-φθάνειν, construction 54
φιάλη 75: plur. *φιάλες* A 158
φιλοτεκνώτερος 182
φοβεῖσθαι ἀπό 47
φόβηθρον -τρον 104
φόβος, *οὐκ ὁ* 129
φορβέα 82
Φρουραί 38
φύλαρχος and *-άρχης* 156
φυλάσσεσθαι ἀπό 46: *φυλάττειν* in Jer. *γ* and 2 M. 11, 123

χ, omission of 114, 116: *χχ* for *κχ* 121
χαβραθά 33
Χάβρεις *-ειν* 164
χάλκε(ι)ος 173
Χαναναῖος, Χανάν(ε)ις *-ειν*, Χαναν(ε)ί, Χαναν-είτης 164, 171: Χαν(α)αν(ε)ῖτις = Χανάαν 170
χάος = (א)גי 38
χάρακες, *χάλικες*, v. ll. 107
χαρβάνη, *χαβράνη* 107 f.
χάρητι 104
χάρις, *χάριν* and *χάριτα* 150
Χάρμεις *-ειν* 164
χανών, *χαυβών* 36
χειλέων 151

χειμάρρους(*χείμαρρος*) 144
χείρ, Hebraic and Greek uses of 44 f.: *χεῖρας* א = *-ρες* 149: *χειρσίν* 151: *χίρους* א = *χειρός* 159
χείρων, *χείριστος* 185
χελώνη = גל 38
Χερμέλ 167
χερούβ -είν (*-είμ*) 33
χιλιάδες and *-ας*, interchangeable in A א 148 f.
χιτών 36
χοῦς "earth," G. *χοός* 160
χρύσεος 173
χύθρα = *χύτρα* 103
χύμα 79
χυτρόκαυλος -γαυλος 102
χρᾶσθαι, *χρῆσθαι* 76
χῶραι as plur. of *χῆ* 143

ψ replaced by *μψ* 108
ψεκάς for *ψακάς* 75: *ψεχάδων* 103
ψέλιον 75
ψόα, *ψύα* 93
ψυδῆν א 176
ψυχή, G. pl. *ψυχᾶν* א 143

ω interchanged with *ο* 89 ff., 194, 198 f. (loss of aug.): with *ου* 91: with *οι* 93, 256
-ώ, fem. names in papyri in 165 n.
ὠδίν, *ἡ* 151
ὦμοις, *ἐφ'* 127
-ών, personal names in, indecl. and gen. *-ῶντος* or *-ῶνος* 165 f.: place-names in, declinable and indecl. 169
-ως, "Attic" declension in, obsolescent 144 f., 173
-ῶσαν, *-ωσαν* 214 f.
ὠτίον, *ἀποκαλύπτειν τὸ* 43
ωυ in Μωυσῆς 163 n.
ὠφελία 87

III. INDEX OF BIBLICAL QUOTATIONS

GENESIS

i. 3 239
11 234
29 f. 174
ii. 17+ ..... 48 n.
23 144
iii. 1 182
20 ..... 163 n.
v. 13 E ..... 63 n.
24 200
vii. 11 203
12 E ..... 63 n.
viii. 2 238
6+ 203
ix. 23 155
xi. 10 41
xiii. 9 126
xiv. 13 ..... 171 n.
14+ 188
xv. 2 33
15 149
xvi. 4 f., 6 43
9 286
xvii. 6+ 261
12, 27 42
13 48
xviii. 2 216
4 290
7 54
10 48
28 E ..... 63 n.
29 53
xix. 6 ..... 203, 278
xxii. 5 91
13 33
16 f. 54
xxiv. 15+ 238
57+ 44
xxv. 1+ 52
xxvi. 18 53
xxvii. 27 177
40 141
43+ 264
xxviii. 19 33
xxix. 3 248
6+ 41
35 ..... 163 n.
xxx. 15 157
21 ..... 161 n.
32 ff. ..... 152 n.
38, 41 146
xxxi. 26 54
39 225
42 A ..... 97 n.
xxxii. 10 218
12 47
xxxiii. 8 A 43
xxxiv. 19 182
26 A ..... 161 n.
30 185
xxxv. 8 183
16 33
xxxvi. 24 33
xxxvii. 3 149
10 199
xxxviii. 9 52
17 ff. 119
xl. 5 192
15 48
xli. 7, 24 147
13+ ..... 52 n.
13 ff. 181
19 184
20 183
54 143
xlii. 10 A 283
16 ..... 54, 83
xliii. 4 91
7+ ... 44, 48, 216
xliv. 5 286
16 91
20 149
xlvi. 4 47
xlvii. 5 217
xlviii. 7, 22 33
10 149
xlviii. 22 141
xlix. 7 A ..... 285 n.
21 118
22 182

EXODUS

i. 1 213
ii. 3 ff. 34, 150
14 A ..... 97 n.
22 34
iii. 2 ff. 145
16+ 280, 285
iv. 6 A ..... 164 n.
8 183
v. 3 A 231
3 F ..... 208 n.
13 A 250
22 A 216
vii. 14 261
19+ 150
viii. 6 A 146
8 91
12 41
16 ff. 106
21, 24 140
ix. 4+ 41
14 137
15 44
18 262
28 239
x. 14 183
xii. 5 ..... 152 n.
8+ 231
16 A 272
19 34
22 154
43 42
44 B 175
xiii. 15 54
xiv. 13 A 225
14 232
xv. 1 47
9 141

xv. 22 200
23 ..... 168 n.
xvi. 4 ..... 41, 262
33 ..... 146, 177
xvii. 14 B 165
xviii. 7 41
xix. 16, 19 239
xxi. 13 128
21 ..... 234, 261
xxii. 6 147
8, 11 83
29 288
xxiii. 4 48
5 90
19 128
20 66
xxvi. 7 A 284
33 183
xxvii. 5+ ..... 180 n.
20 B 272
xxviii. 17 129
21+ 188
23+ 257
28+ 224
35 B+ ... 103
37 44
xxix. 1 42
9 269
23 255
27 202
43 286
xxx. 32 221
xxxi. 15 A 35
17 280
xxxii. 32 251
34 285
xxxiii. 10 253
13 ..... 193 n.
xxxiv. 18 231
23 A ..... 138 n.
24 ..... 66 n.
xxxv. 5 191
25 277

LEVITICUS

i. 10+ ..... 152 n.
ii. 2 177
13 152
iii. 9 93
v. 8 106
vi. 5 ..... 274 n.
vi. 37+ 136
vii. 8 48
viii. 4 207
ix. 2 210
x. 16 48
xi. 21 183
26 76
xii. 5 B 272
xiii. 7+ 48
15 176
41 ff. 104
55 223
55 A 243
xiv. 16 A 283
xv. 2+ 46
12 237
xvi. 2+ 183
23 ... 94, 197, 205
xviii. 3+ 200
xix. 13 ..... 128, 230
15 ..... 44, 232
19 224
36 154
xx. 10 276
xxi. 11 140
xxiii. 5 40
40 104
xxiv. 19+ 255
xxv. 10 232
23 282
27 192
33 131
34 ..... 4, 172 n.
51 44
xxvi. 9 ..... 232, 261
16 160
xxvii. 12, 14 ... 254
28+ ..... 66 n.

NUMBERS

i. 18 267
ii. 4 285
iii. 3+ ..... 205 n.
16 44
37+ 145
iv. 49 137
v. 19, 28 172
vi. 6 140
21 44
vii. 20+ 177
ix. 20 39
ix. 22 40
x. 35 ..... 285 n.
xi. 5 99
8 259
xii. 14+ 48
15 A 74
xiii. 20 172
xiv. 14 280
23 ..... 83, 125
xv. 5 192
20 137
xvi. 22 145
41 274
46 210
xx. 5 A 285
14 217
xxi. 1, 3+ 164
9 ..... 242 n.
24 141
xxii. 6+ 208
17 47
22 197
28 287
xxiv. 1 40
11 219
13 A 177
22 B 98
xxv. 3, 5 286
13 ..... 172 n.
15 33
xxvi. 53 276
xxxi. 30 ..... 180 n.
46 B+ 188
xxxii. 13 88
33 ..... 180 n.
34, 37 ... 200
xxxiv. 5 A 144
xxxv. 2–7 ..... 4 n.
33 271
xxxvi. 6 43

DEUTERONOMY

i. 1 173
7+ ..... 166 n.
24 213
ii. 25 ..... 149 n.
iii. 13 ..... 180 n.
iv. 25 43
32 259
35+ 278
vii. 23 A 230

ix. 2 278
10 A 206
x. 1 ff. 183
8 + ... 253
xi. 7 212
30 125
xii. 2 179
8, 25 43
xiii. 5+ 191
xiv. 8 76
20 128
21 B 125
xv. 8 B 243
10 ..... 48, 243
18 125
xvii. 6 ..... 44, 135
11 44
15 A 248
xviii. 3 81
10 271
xix. 9 190
15 44
xx. 7+ 205
20+ 217
xxi. 3 f. ... 128 B, 267 n.
5 253
7 B 128
8 271
11 B 190
13 ..... 39, 272
14 48
20 B 107
23 208
xxii. 6 160
9 99
xxiii. 8 239
15 255
17 228
24 147
xxiv. 3 184
13 48
xxv. 2 ..... 42, 271
18 242
xxvi. 13 271
15 B. 125
xxviii. 1 39
39 218
48 8
50 232
56 261
66 220
xxix. 16 200
18 289
26 235
xxx. 1, 3 ..... 285 n.
9 53
xxxi. 16 218
17 214
27, 29 184
28 156
xxxii. 5 214
6 136
10 ..... 142, 200
28 279
29 258
34 125
37 196
43 264
xxxiii. 6 39
9 ... 128, 204
16 145
xxxiv. 5 7

JOSHUA

i. 4+ ..... 166 n.
ii. 14 ..... 256 n.
iii. 4 137
iv. 14 ..... 242 n.
v. 4 271
5 170
10 A 157
vi. 4 f. 234
10 232
18 191
22 A+ 186
22 B 135
vii. 21 B 36
viii. 7, 9 156
18 154
ix. 3 200
6 ..... 170 n.
20 44
31 43
x. 1 B, 4 B 200
14 184
40 212
xiv. 4 4
6 217
10 ..... 189 n.
xv. 11 A ..... 169 n.
60 ..... 170 n.
xvii. 13 B 47
xvii. 15, 18 271
xviii. 12 176
24+ 188
xxi. 2–42 4
18 ff. ..... 148 n.
xxii. 7 A ..... 180 n.
20 125
26, 28 128
31 119
xxiii. 4 ..... 192, 284
13 102
xxiv. 33 A 237

JUDGES

i. 10 118
16 B ..... 164 n.
35 B+ 151
ii. 11 43
iii. 7 ..... 43, 216 A
19+ ... 225 A, 253 B
25 150
29 B 174
iv. 9 49
16 24
22 B+ ... 119, 204
v. 3+ 55, 231
13 B 84
20 A 283
29 239
vi. 3 B 212
17 43
18 ..... 55, 272 B
28 B 202
30 B+ 210
38 282
vii. 3 B. ..... 149 n.
4 B. 175, 271
7 A 110
12 A 197
13 B. 199
21 B. 255
viii. 1 B 240
3 B 201
7 B 33
26 36
28 B+ 53
ix. 9 ff. B 234
15 B ..... 193 n.
26 A 225
34 B 187
36 B 262

ix. 45 152
x. 10 B 34
16 B 112
xi. 20 B 233
25 B+ 184
33 B 136
35 A ... 182, 208 n.
35 B ... 159, 256
xii. 5 A 52
xiii. 10 280
xiv. 6 61
12, 13 36
14 B 226
17 B 208
xv. 5 ..... 147 A, 236 B
8 A 101
13 A 186
xvi. 9 B 285
20+ 40
21 ... 173 B, 259
26 B ... 223, 225
28 B+ 145
30 B 222
xvii. 8 ff. B 162
xviii. 3 B+ ..... 258 n.
9 A 208
15 ... 40 B, 41 A
22 275
22 A... 206, 273
24 273
27 B 125
29 B 33
xix. 9 A+ 272
26 B 288
28 A 197
30 B 204
xx. 2 B 254
28 253
31 B, 39 B ... 287
32 B 183
34 B 289
xxi. 17 A 221
21 A 230

RUTH

i. 13 ..... 238, 268
ii. 2+ 43
9 ..... 218, 241
14 218
16 222
iii. 2 256
iii. 10 ..... 184 n.
iv. 4 43
7 175

1 KINGDOMS

i. 2, 4 143
12+ 54, 282
16 172
18+ 43
28 249
ii. 8 247
14 B 103
27 49
iii. 10+ 40
14+ 271
iv. 5 25
12 283
v. 1 25
4 ..... 33, 38
4 A 102
5 A 101
6 235
9 159
vi. 1 ff. 147
18 A 255
21 286
viii. 3 A 212
7 B 105
ix. 2 181
15+ 43
24 255
x. 4+ 40
5 B 35
xi. 8 B+ ... 175, 285
11 A 288
xii. 3 282
xiii. 4 287
xiv. 30 226
36 A 288
47 38
xv. 12 253
23 B 37
35 240
xvi. 11 181
20 32
xvii. 4 ..... 151 n.
5 265
33 A 241
39 220
43 ..... 185, 186
xix. 6 54
xx. 3 54
26 275
42 ..... 89, 205
xxi. 13 ..... 75 n., 155
xxii. 23 A 206
xxiii. 1 145
7 A 220
13 221
21 218
22 96
23 A 227
xxiv. 4 183
12 274
xxv. 15 f. 256
18 32
20 ..... 140, 212 A
21 289
xxvi. 16 42
19 223
xxvii. 7 40
xxviii. 2 136
xxx. 12 197
xxxi. 9 268

2 KINGDOMS

i. 2 A 283
3 221
6 ..... 49, 156
10 ..... 157, 278
18 178
21 ... 221 n. A, 261
ii. 13 A 213
26 A 216
29 212
30 ..... 284 n.
iii. 13 217
22 212
25 138
29 122
39 256
iv. 1 201
6 ..... 222, 271
11 274
v. 2+ 217
21 ..... 213, 227
vi. 3 212
8 192
14 265
19 37
20 49
vii. 10 42

vii. 25 145
27 43
viii. 7 166
10 40
ix. 7 218
x. 3 ..... 43, 235
xi. 2 ..... 275 n.
7 40
20 A ..... 267 n.
xii. 3 61
5 42
xiii. 6, 8 92
10 210
13+ 217
15 B ..... 184 n.
xiv. 2 f. 217
11 53
14 ..... 204 n.
16 231
22+ 43
26 52
30 283
xv. 14 141
23 ..... 169 n.
32 ..... 37, 283
xvi. 13 160
14 A 212
xvii. 8 B ..... 78 n.
19 221
28 156
29 121
xviii. 3 ..... 49, 217
11 197
18 45
19, 31 268
19, 22 ..... 232 n.
23 167
33 54
xix. 3 54
6 ... 212 A, 242 n.
42 49
xx. 3 39
15 213
18 49
20+ 38
xxii. 3 281
5 269
16 37
27 ..... 217, 285 A
40 248
xxiii. 20 185
xxiii. 25 ff. 171
xxiv. 1 237
22 210
21, 25...220, 238

3 KINGDOMS

i. 13 272
ii. 1 239
3 ..... 164 n.
8 A 242
13 40
26 3
28 272
46 e 153
iii. 4 182
18+ 61
iv. 7 ..... 50 n.
19 A 157
20 A 226
21 A, 23 153
32 B 164
v. 4 281
14 B ..... 149 n.
vi. 2 154
12 A 259
13 266
18 39
33 221
vii. 24, 29 102
31, 35 150
viii. 1 3
8 280
11 225
32 A+ 90
33 240
37 B 175
41 A 135
50 A 213
53 B ... 70, 125
54 A 152
ix. 5 A 102
15 3
25 A 190
x. 3 204
8 A 225
13 197
21 A 206
23 183
xi. 3+ 149
11, 31 247
14 B 167
xi. 19 A 186
29 B+ ..... 78 n.
38 3
43 B ..... 50 n.
xii. 4 ..... 87, 179
4 A 155
18 289
24 r B ... 115, 151
xiii. 26, 29 3
xiv. 1–20 3
2 A 241
4 A 149
6 A 218
8 A 157
14 f. A 287
xv. 6 A 77
13 38
22 175
xvi. 9 ..... 180 n.
23 189
24 ..... 167, 186
28 c B... 70, 125
33 53
xvii. 4 218
12 A+ 110
16 199
xviii. 2 B 146
18 227
19 f. 171
32+ 37
43 f. 136
45 272
xx. 18 A 206
xxi. 15 175
22 258
23 ..... 84 n.
23, 25 178
32 255
38 ... 76 A, 264
xxii. 10 A 158
31 ... 135 B, 186 A
35 225
47–50 3
49 A 132

4 KINGDOMS

i. 18 a 188
ii. 8 235
10 54
12 A 125
19+ 262

ii. 25+ 171
iii. 10 A ..... 206 n.
18 B 172
iv. 3 B 112
26 40
27 204
32 A 273
v. 7 51
11 47
14 136
17 32
19 33
vi. 7 275
20 A+ 209
30 51
vii. 2, 19 218
6 148
18 A 158
viii. 1 A 272
10, 14 49
ix. 24 44
27 A 102
30 107
34 209
x. 19+ 45, 284
27 92
xi. 3 227
10 B, 15 B ... 156 n.
xii. 4 3
8 B 37
15 250
xiii. 7 A 149
23 200
xiv. 9 157
14 42
xv. 19 A 157
20 174
xvi. 9 3
17 39
18 154
xvii. 7 52
9 75
14 3
20 f. 200
xviii. 17 101
19 281
30 125
32 232
35 143
37 283
xix. 4 B 84
xix. 11 ..... 143, 238
21 B 105
29 A 218
37 ..... 111 n.
xx. 13 200
xxi. 6 53
7 A 132
13 ..... 153, 155 n.
14+ 204
16 A 181
xxii. 3+ 121
12 162
xxiii. 18 ... 45, 238
30 102
xxiv. 14 175
16 B 103
17 121
xxv. 4 A 151
9 ..... 3, 175

1 CHRONICLES

iv. 21 f. 33
v. 10 B 151
19 ..... 171 n.
vi. 63+ 188
71 A 180
x. 13 239
xi. 19 38
xii. 36 A 149
xv. 3 207
21 33
xvi. 32 B 132
43 138
xvii. 9 42
10 ..... 138, 261
25 43
xviii. 10 40
xix. 3 ..... 43, 235
xx. 1 258
xxi. 15 ..... 199, 253 n.
20 A 227
26 260
xxiii. 17 261
25 281
xxiv. 17 189
xxv. 5 A 149
28 189
xxvi. 27 288
xxvii. 1 175
21 180
33 37
xxviii. 9 B ... 115, 234
xxix. 11 ... 94, 157
23 268
28 149
29 184

2 CHRONICLES

v. 2 207
11 52
vi. 7 ..... 50 n.
28 175
30 270
vii. 10 189
ix. 20 61
x. 11 B+ ... 115, 151
xiv. 6+ 281
xvii. 9 B 95
xviii. 7 137
34 ..... 234, 266
xix. 3 200
11 175
xx. 15 191
37 B 198
xxi. 8 190
17 182
19 40
xxiii. 2 B 149
11 157
xxiv. 24 ..... 267 n.
xxv. 18 34
19 258
24 42
26 125
xxvi. 3+ 41
15 ..... 54, 262
21 B 117
xxvii. 5 250
xxviii. 9 288
22 53
xxix. 3 203
24 271
35+ ... 104, 199
xxx. 15 189
xxxi. 7 154
15 B ..... 165 n.
xxxii. 31 B 97
xxxiii. 1 188
3 53
6+ 54
xxxiv. 11 ..... 88 n.
20 162

xxxv. 3..... 61

1 ESDRAS

i. 7 A 148
30 B 77
38 173
46 126
53 B 82
ii. 4 223
6 255
7 254
11 106
16 ..... 161 n.
18 ..... 99, 288
21 237
iii. 5+ ..... 46, 103 B
7 271
iv. 7, 50 251
30 250
31 B 79
32, 34 127
40, 43 157
42 186
45 B 199
49 B 114
v. 8 A ..... 165 n.
16 B, 48+ ... 164 n.
28 B 164
46 B 117
70 B 114
vi. 11 199
19 154
22 B 197
26 156
33 B 114
viii. 35+ 188
45 237
58, 92 156
63 138
70 283
ix. 14 164

2 ESDRAS

i. 11 B+ 93
ii. 2 B ..... 161 n.
6, 18 188
15, 64 74
36+ 165
69 36
iii. 7+ 167, 210
13 273
iv. 10+ 167
12+ 154
17 249
24 242
v. 3 192
8 B 93
vi. 9 152
18 87
20 B 74
vii. 1 162
12 197
17 174
20 288
28+ 233
viii. 27 A..... 173
30..... 210
ix. 1 ...164, 167, 171 n.
5 247
8 ..... 223 n.
14+ 53
x. 1 209
2 .....207, 262 n.
13 54
xi. 2 B 237
3 202
7 ℵ 209
xii. 4, 17 209
13 130
xiii. 28..... 183
xv. 15 A ..... 63 n.
xvi. 9 ℵ 149
xvii. 2 34
3 ...37, 94,
224, 236, 244 ℵ
65 229
67 ℵ ..... 63 n.
xviii. 4..... 162, 254
15 ..... 179, 210
xix. 1 189
10 A 216
11 B 119
20 f. 288
22 B 148
30 A 201
32 B 112
34 206
38 135
xx. 31 230
xxii. 44 253
xxiii. 15 149
19 236
xxiii. 25 208 n., 260
31 34

PSALMS

ii. 1 289
v. 8 ..... 158 n.
vii. 14+ 201
ix. 7+ ..... 159 n.
29..... 156
31..... 232
xiii. 3+ 82
xv. 8..... 204
xvi. 8 142
xvii. 27..... 285
30..... 238
40+..... 248
xviii. 11+ 38
xx..... 68
12 255
xxi. 32+ 287
xxiv. 8 A..... 178 n.
xxvii. 2+ 243
7 262
xxviii. 10..... 273
xxx. 23 120
xxxi. 1..... 201
xxxii. 10 247
xxxiii. 3+ 219
xxxvi. 21..... 250
xxxvii. 8 93
xxxviii. 10 94
xl. 3 256
12 205
xliii. 6+... 105, 248
xlviii. 12 143
l. 9 283
li. 3 218
liv. 12+ 38
lix. 3+ 200
7+ 238
lxiv. 4 198
10+ 54
lxv. 15..... 75 n.
lxvii. 25 270
32 289
lxviii. 5 225
lxx. 9, 18..... 150
lxxvi. 68
lxxvii. 11 ... 89, 216
23..... 203
64..... 210

lxxviii. 11+ ... 42
lxxix. 14 ... 224, 235
lxxx. 2 ... 35
lxxxi. 2 ... 44
lxxxii. 11 ... 199
lxxxiii. 12 ... 158 n.
lxxxvi. 1+ ... 154
lxxxvii. 17 ... 289
xci. 15 ... 149
xciii. tit. ... 189 n.
13 ... 237
xciv. 10 ... 63 n.
ci. 12 ... 238
20 ℵ ... 160
ciii. 5 ... 238
17 A ... 76
31 ... 257
civ. 30 ... 201, 267
43 B+ ... 101
cv. 13+ ... 216
28 ... 286
cviii. 23 A ... 200
cix. 4 ... 240
cxi. 5 ... 249
cxviii. 51 ... 207
53 ... 227
103 ... 179
112 A ... 110
127 ... 38
131 ... 201
166 ... 241
cxx. 3 f. ... 222
cxxi. 2+ ... 253
cxxiii. 4 ... 144
cxxv. 2 ... 54
cxxxi. 12 ... 271
cxxxvii. 7+ ... 232
cxxxviii. 15 ... 183
16 ... 263
20 ... 150
cxl. 4 ... 94
cxlvii. 7 ... 232
cli. 6 ... 260

PROVERBS

i. 1 ... 166
iii. 5 ... 281
14 ... 122
16 a+ ... 158 n.
28+ ... 257
v. 19 ... 85, 185
vi. 3 ... 207
6 ... 257 n.
25 ... 236
vii. 2 ... 232
10 ... 282
11 ... 128
16 ... 156, 286
22 ... 154
viii. 19 ... 38
ix. 11 ... 232
18 ... 79
x. 13 ... 137
17 B ... 115
xii. 14 A ... 101
xiii. 4+ ... 173
11 ... 249
14 ... 270 n.
xiv. 5 ℵ ... 272
34 ... 122
xvi. 23 ... 219
30 A ... 280 n.
xviii. 4 ... 85
16 ... 272
20+ ... 249
23+ ... 94
xxii. 8 ... 229
15 ... 260
xxiii. 1+ ... 47
21 ... 283
24 ... 47
xxiv. 11+ ... 274
14 ... 240
16 ... 136
21 ... 61 n., 192
22 a ... 47 n.
54 ... 152
xxv. 1 ... 166
21 ... 242
23 ... 143
xxvi. 8 ... 250
19 ... 279
xxvii. 7 ... 179
25 ... 93, 243
xxviii. 15 A ... 160
xxix. 42 ... 36

ECCLESIASTES

i. 7 ... 53
14 ... 133 n.
ii. 6 ... 226
18 ... 251
iii. 18+ ... 41
19 ... 281
20 ... 160
iv. 2 ... 270 n.
v. 5 ... 234
11 ... 251
14 ... 53, 269 n.
vii. 16 A ... 246
23 b ... 190
viii. 10 ... 219
14 A ... 226
ix. 18 ... 230
xi. 4 ... 229
xii. 3 f. ... 259
5 ... 158

SONG

i. 4 ... 232
ii. 12 ... 289
15 ... 282
iii. 8 ... 158
v. 2 ... 75 n., 259
12 ... 220
13 A ... 158
vii. 2 ... 288
13 ... 157 f.

JOB

ii. 3 A ... 163
9 A ... 136
11 ... 171
iii. 5+ ... 260
21 ... 97
iv. 6+ ... 129
v. 4 ... 122
vi. 10 A ... 199
12+ ... 173
14+ ... 275 n.
15+ ... 182
vii. 2 ... 287
6+ ... 182
(? Θ) 7 ... 53
viii. 1 ... 171
ix. 33 A ... 92, 187
x. 15 A ... 110
16+ ... 279
20 ... 126
xi. 18 ... 281
xii. 6 A ... 280 n.
18 ... 272
xiii. 10 ... 47

xiii. 15+ 83
20.....92, 187
27 A..... 216
xiv. 17 223
xv. 35 A 131
xvii. Θ 12..... 47
xviii. 7+ ... 215, 286
8..... 236, 266
xix. 16 243
24 ℵ 173
xx. 7 278
Θ 9+ 53
xxi. 3, 5 232
24..... 75 n., 177
xxii. 3 A 256
Θ 14 280
Θ 16 154
xxiii. 3 A, 5 ... 240, 263
xxiv. 6 201
8 ..... 75 n.
Θ 17 159
25 249
xxvi. Θ 1 47
Θ 7 ... 143, 227
7, 9 247
9 A 284
xxvii. 1+ 52
2 136
5+ 223
7 248
Θ 21 C..... 110 n.
Θ 22 119
xxviii. Θ 16, 19... 261
Θ 17 (19) 75 n., 126
Θ 18 276
xxix. 2 A 123
3 260
14+ ... 75, 197
18 232
Θ 19 277
xxx. 8 284
30 38
xxxi. Θ 1 47
6 A..... 247 n.
24 225
32 A..... 200
35 A..... 198
40 A..... 193 n.
xxxii. 7..... 129
Θ 12..... 47
19..... 283
xxxiii. 5 f. ... 137
Θ 31 55
xxxiv. 11 250
Θ 32... 53, 201
xxxvi. 5 115
Θ 8... 238, 268
Θ 21 47
xxxvii. 10..... 159
12..... 183
xxxviii. 4...217, 256
Θ 26...129, 262
xxxix. 2 177
Θ 4 118
Θ 8 47
(? Θ) 27 272
30 253
Θ 31 239
xl. 2 239
5 75
6 175
18 240
27 A..... 114
xli. 6 96
8 46
9 A 288
14..... 243
xlii. 8 44
17 e..... 171

WISDOM

i. 8+ 62
14 157
ii. 3 221
22 ℵ 143
iii. 2+ 43, 253
11..... 91
iv. 7+ 289
9 149
11 222
19 137
v. 11..... 282
16..... 157
17 ℵ..... 158 n.
23 A..... 132
vi. 8 128
viii. 18 257
ix. 13 240
17 137
x. 7 ℵ 140
xi. 4, 8 ..... 157 n.
9 220
xi. 14, 18 103
23 242
xii. 11 209
19 250
23 234
xiii. 9 .....184, 192
14 224
xiv. 5 185
xv. 13 79
xvi. 18 B 85
19 118
21 272
28 A..... 226
xvii. 4 A 123
9 289
15 78
21 ..... 281 n.
xviii. 2 226
4 198
16 197
19 155

SIRACH

prol. 15f., 59n., 91, 264
i. 6+ 96
ii. 14+ 279
iii. 12+ 149
15 ℵ 260
16 209
17 176
iv. 3 .....199, 280
25 104
vi. 2, 25 222
3 230
7, 19 218
30+..... 173
vii. 36+ 231
ix. 10 126
17 219
x. 18..... 118
xi. 1 271
5 219
11+ 192, 288
xiii. 5 218
10..... 248
22..... 286
xiv. 18 179
xv. 2..... 231
4 .....223, 238
20 A..... 255

xvi. 7 A 271
12 A ..... 274 n.
13 288
17 276
20+ 240
23+ ..... 122 n.
xvii. 3 127
22 ℵ 143
xviii. 17 125
xix. 13+ 53
26 177
xx. 7 232
9 A 91
12 225
xxi. 27 163
xxii. 4 172
7 A 179
11 126
14 A 106
18 107
21+ 125
xxiii. 4 145
11 ℵ 151
21 282
27 122
xxiv. 22 .....128, 231
xxv. 6 B 114
xxvi. 17 B 103
xxvii. 4 84
5 ℵ+ 265
24 199
xxviii. 1 .....49, 229
11+ 243
15 219
19 128
20 173
23 94
xxix. 4 277
6 229
xxx. 25 289
38 281
xxxi. 10 221
xxxii. 24 ℵ 256
xxxiv. 1+ 247
21 91
22 105
27+ 122, 126
xxxvi. 19 76
26 ... 123, 151 ℵ
xxxvii. 2 257
xxxviii. 7 175
xxxviii. 13 91
28..91, 141, 231
xxxix. 26 A 152
xl. 28 .....234, 261
xlii. 8 173
16 177
21 122
xliii. 14 203
16, 20 232
17 282
17, 20 143
26 91
xliv. 23 .....186, 188
xlv. 9 185
23 255
xlvi. 7 ..... 164 n.
9 149
20 207
xlvii. 9 ..... 159 n.
xlix. 11 130
l. 7 91
12 ..... 253 n.
16 234
18 185
li. 5 B 159
19 275

ESTHER

A. 7 159
11 ℵ 263
i. 6 280
15 237
19 122
ii. 9 B 91
iii. 13+ 77
B. 5 B 119
iv. 4 A 250
11 A 183
C. 14 243
21 ..... 240 n.
D. 6 ..... 197, 265
vii. 3 113
8 197
viii. 3 52
4 253
E. 7 A 182
7, 11 192
12 ..... 197 A, 219 ℵ
viii. 15 37
ix. 6 38
25 233
ix. 27 255
30 ..... 64 n.
F. 3 235

JUDITH

i. 4 ℵ 266
15 108
ii. 5 ℵ 148
5+ 188
13 275
v. 18 ..... 85, 126
vi. 13 234
15+ 164
vii. 10 212
14, 25 286
viii. 12 255
23 87
24 223
ix. 1+ 197
3 240
6 172
14 278
x. 6 ..... 128, 164
10 ℵ 242
xi. 3 ℵ 234
8 96
10, 16 264
22+ 239
xii. 8 243
xiii. 5 221
9 126
xiv. 3 135
5 263
6 162
15 ℵ 202
xvi. 8 264
10 A 143

TOBIT

i. 6+ 25
15 B 207
17 B.....119, 204
19 ℵ 234
20...143, 162 ℵ, 222
ii. 3 244
10 B 120, 203
13 A 273
iii. 12 ℵ 262
18 220
iv. 13 82
18 172

iv. 19 ℵ+ 183
v. 3 ℵ 192
5..... 25, 217 ℵ
15 24
19 ..... 289n.
vi. 13...164 n. ℵ, 219 B
18 A 197
vii. 11 ff. 164n., 254n.B
viii. 12..... 209
ix. 3 205
6 280
x. 2 ℵ 238
7 227
10 ..... 180n.
xi. 2 B 216
8 ℵ 232
13 ℵ 192
19 B 162
xii. 3 176
6 B..... 244
19 280
22 B..... 199
xiii. 13 104
16 .....99 ℵ, 121 B
xiv. 2 ℵ 83
4 237
5 183

HOSEA

ii. 18..... 125
iii. 2 32
iv. 14+.....276, 286n.
16.....200, 279
v. 1 ..... 102, 170
14 230
vii. 1 201
viii. 5 199
ix. 10 A ..... 90n.
xi. 11 ..... 282n.
12 272
xii. 11 38
xiii. 6 .....89, 216
7 76
xiv. 1 B..... 121
8 271

AMOS

i. 3 286
9 A+ 187
iii. 11 222
12 37
iv. 4 54
v. 2 286
vi. 10 229
viii. 3.....106 B, 232
11, 13..... 157n.
ix. 1 ..... 253n.
2 A 237
3 234
8 47

MICAH

i. 6..... 38
iv. 3 108
v. 2 130
vi. 14..... 218
16..... 109
vii. 11 94
12 B 85

JOEL

i. 20+ 37
ii. 21..... 54
iii. 12 271

OBADIAH

i. 2 39
11 256

JONAH

ii. 4 ℵ 190
ix. 6 ff. 104
7 143

NAHUM

i. 4 199
5 ℵA ..... 133n.
11 ℵ 130
ii. 7 94
8 A 226
11 ℵ 221
iii. 17..... 75, 159
19 ℵ..... 147

HABAKKUK

i. 14 ℵ 147
ii. 5 279
7 A 101
iii. 3 179
6 ..... 172n.

ZEPHANIAH

i. 4 B 147
18+ ..... 158n.
ii. 9 230
14 106
iii. 2 A 225

HAGGAI

ii. 9 ..... 184n.

ZECHARIAH

i. 3 ℵ..... 102
11+ ..... 253n.
14, 17..... 234
16 232
18 B+ ..... 73n.
20 ℵ 149
21 202
ii. 2 192
8 143
13 266
iii. 2..... 125, 221
iv. 7+ 150
10+ 290
13 ℵ 125
v. 2 ..... 151n.
7 ℵ 116
vi. 6 104
13 272
viii. 2 244
x. 3 199
xi. 3 90
7 170
12 ..... 275n.
16 227
xii. 11 38
xiii. 2 ℵ..... 88n.
xiv. 4..... 38

MALACHI

i. 4 53
8 f.+..... 44
ii. 3 81
12 ℵ 130
13 ℵ 242
iii. 2 93
3 228, 230 A, 271
7 B 114
14 81

ISAIAH

i. 8 107
17 B 114
25 230
26 A+ 90
29 240
ii. 4 .....108, 109
13 B 114
15 ℵ 175
v. 1 .....42, 231
6 B 117
22 246
27 222
28 179
29 f. 212, 232
vi. 2 135
3 f. 225
5 131
9 ..... 231 f.
vii. 3..... 101
9..... 167
22..... 185
viii. 14+ 281
21 146
x. 3 262
xiv. 1 34
8 273
11 286
12 42
13+ 271
16 232
xvi. 2 282
5 272
7+ 232
xvii. 11..... 240
xviii. 2..... 95
xix. 6 B+ 151
8 84
10 218
17 104
18 246
xx. 2 .....80 A, 197 ℵ
xxi. 10 42
xxii. 5 ℵ 159
11 ...151 B, 183
22 150
xxiii. 1 ..... 167 n.
8..... 122
9..... 174
12..... 171
16.....88, 254
xxiv. 18 203
xxv. 9 ℵ 102
10 A 242
xxvi. 10 209
xxvii. 12...151 B, 167 n.
xxviii. 9 197
12 ℵ 212
20 249
27 271
xxix. 2..... 159
6 B..... 117
8..... 242
13 ℵ..... 241
19..... 125
xxx. 2 ..... 199, 262
12 281
13 ℵ 140
15 136
19 B ...113, 147
27 ℵ 177
32 B 196
xxxii. 4 .....81, 147 n.
11 B 147
xxxiii. 4 232
6..... 81, 147 n.
11 240
xxxiv. 4 236
13 289
14 231
xxxvi. 2 .....101, 147 B
6.....137, 223
xxxvii. 3 151
10 ℵ 256
11 238
22 B 99
29 147
31 289
35 ℵ 147
36 ℵ 148
38...116 B, 156 n.
xl. 15 .....75 n., 155
26 262
xli. 7 141
14 B 112
xlii. 4 221
11, 14..... 232
20 203
xliii. 17..... 284
xliv. 2 262
12, 15 201
26 248
xlvi. 4 150
12 279
xlviii. 10 128
xlix. 10..... 219
20 .....206, 279
26 240
li. 20 .....123, 177
liii. 7..... 127
liv. 11 B 121
17 ..... 8 n.
lv. 7 54
lvi. 3..... 47
lviii. 5 286
8 ..... 90 n.
lix. 2 248
14 .....249, 260
lx. 6..... 130
10+ 42
14..... 263
16..... 218
17..... 39
20..... 266
lxi. 9 221
11 260
lxii. 6 B.....151, 227
8 42
lxiii. 3 ..... 177 n.
15+ 208
lxiv. 6 119
lxv. 3.....241 ℵ, 270 A
6, 14..... 232
13 233
lxvi. 2 232
4 127
9 125
11 ℵ 158
16 273
23 35

JEREMIAH

i. 3 162
10+ 128, 253
12 224
18 A 160
ii. 8 A 283
15 ℵ 113
30 175
22 93
27 155
36 199
iii. 8+ ... 197 ℵ, 276
16 237
21+ 89, 216
24 260

iv. 19 ℵ 113
30 107
31 202
v. 4 B 198
6 224
22 A 241
27 ℵ 177
vi. 4 272
7 290
8 ℵ 192
15 ℵ+ 199
17 ℵ 132
23 108
25 114
27 39
29 B 106
vii. 16 127
18 36
viii. 2+ 273
6 173
7 37
ix. 6 38
12 A ..... 252 n.
26 173
x. 9 45
20 279
25 ℵ 213
xi. 16 82
19 276
xiii. 11 175
xiv. 16 B 119
22 262
xv. 3 B ..... 73 n.
xvi. 16 84
xvii. 5 228
16 217
18 A+ 146
xix. 1, 10 34
xxi. 13 167
xxii. 17 243
19 221
xxiii. 29 153
xxiv. 2 A, 10 A ... 90
xxv. 16 ℵ 76, 128
xxvi. 5 ..... 242, 273
18 170
19 ℵ ..... 130 n.
xxvii. 2 B 100
7 260
25 94
xxviii. 4 ℵ+ ... 79
11 B 108
xxviii. 14 A+ ... 226
16 ..... 159 n.
40 ℵ 229
41 ℵ 206
56 ℵ 212
xxix. 2 144 ℵ, 226 A ... 231
6 128
8, 13 .. 11, 244 n.
11 ℵ 197
13 A 218
21 ..... 185, 221
xxx. 1 ..... 11, 139 ℵ
3 ℵ 232
10 220
xxxi. 7 109
9 260
12 B 92
13 199
18 ℵ ..... 92, 94 n.
25 202
33 ... 14, 37, 170, 221
31, 36 14, 38
37 ..... 273 n.
44 A 139
xxxii. 7 170
9 174
12 ℵ 148
16 ..... 14, 37
19 237
22 ℵ 113
xxxv. 8 143
xxxvi. 8 ℵ 76
23 276
xxxvii. 6 139
14 ℵ 89, 216
xxxviii. 3 A ..... 172 n.
8 32
9 151
21 ..... 14, 38
28 224
34 278
36 ℵ 132
xxxix. 5 272
15 274
27 ℵ 227
35 ℵ 93
40 B 172
xl. 4 ℵ 202
xli. 3 ℵ 159
5 ..... 14, 37
xli. 6 B 81
10 ..... 200, 214
16 197
xliv. 9 287
xlv. 26 ..... 158 n.
xlvi. 1 f. 162
xlvii. 7 + ... 208
xlviii. 5 A 283
li. 14 221
16 231
19 36
27 224
33 120
lii. 1, 31 ... 189 with n.
4 88
11 ℵ 162
13 B 93
19 ..... 97 B, 121
21 f. ..... 151 n.
24 B, 31 A ... 123
34 250

BARUCH

i. 10 235
19 256
ii. 9 224
12 234
19 ..... 158 n.
25 119
iii. 32 ..... 278 n.
iv. 7 199
12 61
25 102

LAMENTATIONS

i. 7, 9+ 116
14 224
ii. 15 f. 222
iii. 8 232
42 234
43 f. 284
44 ..... 82, 135
45 A ..... 204 n.
iv. 7 271
16 44
19 ..... 282 n.

EPISTLE JER.

9 259
10 A 117
25 127
39+ 194

40 240
43 128
58 290
61 f. 237
66 229
69 107

EZEKIEL

i. 6, 8 ..... 73 n.
10 A 160, 187
26 B 121
ii. 6 279
10 235
iii. 10 A 206
14 38
20+ 276
iv. 9 ff. 218
vi. 9 A 89, 205
vii. 19 A 241
viii. 15 A 212
ix. 1+ 234
2 153
11 239
xii. 12+ 279
16 39
xiii. 4 A 151
xiv. 4, 7 46
xvi. 4 220
7 199
21 A 216
32+ 276
51 ..... 180 n.
xvii. 14 248
xviii. 7 230
xix. 2 239
13 212
xx. 28 175
38 ..... 274 n.
xxi. 10+ 105
22 B 113
31 37
xxii. 13 233
26 B 120
29 243
30 ..... 253 n.
xxiii. 40 107
42 37
xxiv. 7 290
16 A, 23 A ... 220
xxv. 13 Q+ ... 88 n.
xxvi. 1, 17 A ... 239
2 167
xxvi. 18 B+ ... 120
xxvii. 4 34
9 96
11 38
12+ 116, 167 n.
30 ... 231, 286
31 A 269
36 222
xxviii. 2 167
7 286
13 175
16 ..... 64 n.
25 ..... 285 n.
xxix. 4 f. 147
13 ..... 285 n.
xxxi. 8 199
xxxii. 21 122
xxxiii. 8, 13 f. ... 210
15 256
xxxiv. 6 175
31+ 137
xxxv. 5+ ..... 172 n.
xxxvi. 9 232
10 175
24 143
34 267
36 A 55
xxxvii. 1 ff. 144
3 217
xxxviii. 4 265
21 175
xl. 1 A 259
16 B 34
xli. 15 B 106
xlii. 3 92
xliii. 5 B 177
18 243
24 A 152
xliv. 2 61
xlv. 10 154
11, 13 32
xlvi. 1 220
9 ..... 178 n.
xlvii. 3 37
10 84
12 ..... 64 n.
14 A 132
21 229

DANIEL O

ii. 43 220
iii. 19, 94 237
iii. 47 ..... 63 n.
69 159
iv. 26 151
30 b 24
30 c 157
v. 16 218
vi. 1 149
20 212
vii. 8 235
10 203
26 271
28 223
ix. 5 234
26 283
x. 4 189
18 53
xi. 29 ..... 184 n.
36 280
xii. 9 221

SUSANNA O

30 143
54 192

BEL O

11 ..... 150, 220
33 220
34 210

DANIEL Θ

i. 4 B 115
15 204
ii. 21 247
iii. 1 ..... 151 n.
34 256
iv. 2 289
17 288
33+ 90
vi. 4 105
8 103
15 175
18 127
22 200
vii. 10 203
25 ..... 95, 180 n.
viii. 4 144
6 38
7 (12) ... 119, 226
17 f. 240
ix. 2 95
5 234
11, 13 ..... 164 n.

ix. 14 224
20 ..... 158 n.
25 53
26 273
27 ..... 180 n.
x. 3 127
4 ..... 189 with n.
7 B 125
xi. 6 276
10 272
29 ..... 184 n.
34 262
37 175
42 143

SUSANNA Θ

20 220
27+ 143
43 218
56 127

BEL Θ

13 ..... 197, 259
17 172
27 153
32 250
34 210

1 MACCABEES

i. 4 233
10, 20 ..... 189 n.
17+ 151, 160
38+ 118
ii. 9 238
38 35
40 184
54, 57 ..... 172 n.
58 ..... 158 n.
60+ 238
iii. 13 A 190
16 185
17 192
31 A+ 181
34, 37 ..... 180 n.
iv. 5 A 102
13+ ..... 163 n.
38 ℵ 202
v. 14+ 283
38 235
51 274
vi. 1 ..... 169 n. 6
8 240
vi. 12+ 227
18 ..... 223 n.
35 107
vii. 1 189
41 A 148
viii. 1, 13 248
1 A 255
5 171
ix. 6 119
9 A ..... 241 n.
22 ℵ 181
24+ 146, 200
26 241
42 107
44 V ..... 97 n.
x. 11 ..... 88 n.
20+ 128, 253
31 A+ 257
58 250
89 153
xi. 2 241
4 A 206
10 240
23 ..... 274 n.
40 256
xii. 10 220
11 264
27 224
30 209
50 286
xiv. 22+ 97
48 A 255
xv. 27 209
xvi. 23 151

2 MACCABEES

i. 10+ ..... 189 n.
15 160
ii. 17 157
22 173
26 263
iii. 13 194
16, 21 ..... 50 n.
21 242
26 248
30 A 206
40 137
iv. 12 A 106
14 141
16 139
26 220
31+ 184
iv. 36 274
v. 5 220
10 192
20 84
21+ 184, 188
vi. 15 242
17 128
21 ..... 76, 242
23+ 223
vii. 7 A 241
37 173
41 ..... 184 n.
viii. 2 279
3 241
6+ 249
23+ 141
24 83
32 156
ix. 18 125
22 ..... 76, 127
25 ..... 208, 248
x. 21 212
26 173
38 157
xi. 5 ..... 155, 167 n.
20 240
21 189
27, 37 192
30 ..... 189 n.
34 97
xii. 2 156
21 ..... 163 n.
27 46
xiii. 9 ..... 244, 261
25 242
xiv. 4 189
13 ..... 163 n.
16 A 132
21 255
25 235
28, 31 138
29, 32 137
xv. 7 287
12 ..... 180 n.
31 A 181
39 220

3 MACCABEES

i. 2 274
4 283
8 273
9 A 287

i. 22 82
25+ 248
ii. 2 223
19 105
22 f., 33 287
iii. 9 280
10 250
14 278
19 248
22 138
iv. 10 ..... 129, 160 n.
17 153
v. 2 139
12 238
16 136
18 220
20 24
23 225
32 219
35 287
41+ 236, 282
46 145
49 184
51 279
vi. 2 145
5 V 179
18 203
26 263
27 154
34 284
38 ..... 63 n., 189
vii. 12, 19 138
22 82

4 MACCABEES

i. 8+ 81
18 253
28+ 92, 187
29 271
35 ..... 160 n.
ii. 10 148
11 262
19 164
20 249
iv. 2, 6 269
7 285
10 138
13+ 215
22 ..... 137, 253
v. 4 236
v. 28 232
33+ 279
vi. 10 287
17 239
20 232
27 ..... 145, 278
vii. 1 185
viii. 4 240
13 255
19 241
23 179
ix. 4 ..... 158 n.
17 258
23 279
26 & + ... 173
x. 18 ..... 138, 241
xi. 3+ 274
xii. 3 ..... 154, 182
4 253
15 232
xiii. 22 260
27 208
xiv. 15 98
19 287
xv. 5, 30 182
16 221
22 192
xvi. 9 235
xvii. 1 198
5 223
12 157
xviii. 3 A 197
4 212
16 ..... 197, 207

MATTHEW

xiii. 14 231
xxvii. 46 145

MARK

iv. 28 177
viii. 14 ..... 89, 216

LUKE

xiv. 13, 21 83
32 ..... 40 n.
xvi. 29 ..... 164 n.
xix. 8 179
xx. 11 f. 53
xxi. 5 80
xxi. 11 104
25 159

JOHN

iii. 29 49
v. 4 159
xviii. 1 ..... 169 n.

ACTS

iii. 10 158
iii. 11, v. 12 ..... 166 n.
vii. 44 ..... 164 n.
xii. 3 53
xvi. 26 154
xix. 11 53
xxiii. 14 80
xxviii. 26 231

JAMES

v. 17 49

JUDE

4 235

ROMANS

v. 1 ..... 91 n.

1 CORINTHIANS

i. 19 ..... 230 n.
ii. 16 229
iv. 21 47

2 CORINTHIANS

viii. 15 ..... 122 n.

1 THESS.

ii. 8 97
v. 3 128

HEBREWS

iv. 6 268
viii. 11 ..... 278 n.
xii. 18 f. 159

PHILEMON

9 ..... 97 n.

APOCALYPSE

ii. 20 ..... 251 n.
iii. 18 ..... 92 n.
x. 7, xiv. 6 268

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A. AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.